

Several Tracts

AGAINST *F. 10.32*

P O P E R Y.

V I Z.

I. *A Seasonable Discourse, shewing the Necessity of Maintaining the Established Religion, in opposition to Popery.*

II. *A Reasonable Defence of the Seasonable Discourse, &c.*

III. *The Difference between the Church and Court of Rome considered, &c.*

IV. *The late Apology in behalf of the Papists, Reprinted and Answered, &c.*

V. *Considerations touching the true way to suppress Popery in this Kingdom, &c.*

To which is added,

VI. *A Sermon Preached at the Funeral of Sir Edmund Bury Godfrey.*

By the Right Reverend Father in God, *William*
Lord Bishop of *St. Asaph*.

L O N D O N,

Printed for *Charles Brome* at the *Gun* at the West End of
St. Pauls. MDC LXXXIX.

Several Tracts

AGAINST

POPE R. Y.

- I. A Description of the Pope's Office of Managing the Ecclesiastical Revenue in England & Ireland.
- II. A Description of the Pope's Office of Managing the Ecclesiastical Revenue in England & Ireland.
- III. The Difference between the Pope's Office of Managing the Ecclesiastical Revenue in England & Ireland.
- IV. The Difference between the Pope's Office of Managing the Ecclesiastical Revenue in England & Ireland.
- V. The Difference between the Pope's Office of Managing the Ecclesiastical Revenue in England & Ireland.
- VI. The Difference between the Pope's Office of Managing the Ecclesiastical Revenue in England & Ireland.
- VII. The Difference between the Pope's Office of Managing the Ecclesiastical Revenue in England & Ireland.
- VIII. The Difference between the Pope's Office of Managing the Ecclesiastical Revenue in England & Ireland.
- IX. The Difference between the Pope's Office of Managing the Ecclesiastical Revenue in England & Ireland.
- X. The Difference between the Pope's Office of Managing the Ecclesiastical Revenue in England & Ireland.

657:03

A
REASONABLE DEFENCE
OF THE
Seasonable Discourse:

SHEWING
The Necessity of Maintaining the
ESTABLISHED RELIGION
In Opposition to
P O P E R Y.

OR,

A Reply to a Treatise, called, *A Full Answer and
Confutation of a Scandalous Pamphlet, &c.*



L O N D O N,

Printed for *H. Brome*, at the *Gun* at the West-end of *St. Pauls*. 1674.

67:03

A
REASONABLE DEFENCE
OF THE
Seasonable Discourse:

OR,

A Reply to a Treatise called, *A full Answer and
Confutation of a scandalous Pamphlet, &c.*

THe *Seasonable Discourse* shewing the necessity of maintaining the *Established Religion* in opposition to *Papery*, having not long after its coming abroad into the World, been replied unto, under the title of *a full Answer*, it was to be hoped that there would be seen at once put together, all that could be said in defence of the *Roman Cause*: and possibly so it is. However upon perusal it appears, that the Book made good its Title, by being full only of emptiness and railing; and besides, hath the disadvantage to be encumbered by a particular quarrel, which it seems the Author before had managed in the defence of the Loyalty of his Party. Therefore at his first setting forth upon his Controversie, he falls into passion, that any thing should be wrote in a matter wherein he happens to have dealt, without a particular regard to him: as if all mankind were bound to read whatever he wrote, or

A Reasonable Defence

that impertinencies were to be adverted to in a Discourse which pretended to be seasonable. What the Authors triumphs are in his *Catholick Apology*, and his *Reply* to the Answer of it, I am not here concerned to account for; he will find that done else where: my business shall be to vindicate that Discourse in defence of the *Establish'd Religion and Laws*, which our Author, according to his great civility and duty, is pleas'd to complement under the name of a *Scandalous Pamphlet*.

The first exception he takes, is at its pretence to be *seasonable*; and his reason is, because his Majesty put out his gracious Indulgence of Popery, and other *Secularies*; which also confounded the designs of foreign *Achitophels*, and united England as one man, without the least murmur in our streets. Had this been wrote before the last Session of Parliament, we might have taken it for one of our Authors natural streins of Rhetorick, which of course pass with him for demonstrations; but after that his Majesty had recalled it, boldly to tell us that none were aggrieved but *Pulpit-Rabsbekahs*, is Language becoming them, who not long since attempted to blow up the Parliament and King together, and stand in defiance of Majesty and Law. But after all, it so happens, that ever since that this indulgence is withdrawn; we have as vigorously as before pursued the War against the force as well as machinations and designs of foreign *Achitophels*, without any murmur but what proceeded from a few scribbling *Rabsbekahs*: and therefore I may reasonably hope, that notwithstanding our Authors charge, who will needs make me a *Dutchman*, I may, without the help of an Act for Naturalization, be an *Englishman* again. I have (not long since) read in a desperate Book wrote against *Henry IV. of France*,
in

in the time of the Civil War, entituled, *De Justâ Reipub. Christiana in reges impios & hæreticos auctoritate*; an odd Paradox attempted to be proved at large in a Chapter of above 40 Pages, that the *Hugonots* of France were no longer *Frenchmen*. By parity of reason it may be our case here, and no Protestant deserves the name of an *Englishman*: If upon this score it be that I am out-law'd, I must bear the calamity as well as I can; being to suffer as in a very good cause, so also in exceedingly good company.

Our Author having thus unfortunately combated the Title of my Book, the next Attaque is against my manner of expressing the excellency of the Faith of the *English Reformed Church*, with the erroneousness of the *Roman*. And this he overthrows by saying, *he will be bound to describe the Faith of any Christian Congregation in the World, in the very same words*. We will admit that any Christian Church may be so described; but how well such a Picture will represent its Pattern, any sober man will easily judge. I am sure the *being bound*, and offering to lay Wagers, is a very incompetent decision of Controversies: and indeed no body besides one of our Authors Kidney, would disparage the credit of the 39. Articles, the Catechism and Liturgy of the Church of *England*, in the affair for which they are brought; the description of its Faith. For be they whatever our Author, or any other perverse man would have them, they are certainly the most authentic evidence that can be given of what our Church professes.

And as to the *tricking out of Popery*, which he so much dislikes, opposing his crude sentiments concerning *real Presence*, *Infallibility*, *Purgatory*, &c. 'tis sure more reasonable to take the measures of *Popery* from the dictates

A Reasonable Defence

States of the *Council of Trent*, and other publick determinations referred to by me, then what one or two private men will, to serve a present turn, declare to be their Judgment or Opinion. 'Tis true, Cardinal *Bellarmino* is quoted sometimes by me; and so soon as his authority, and those who go along with him, shall be allowed to have no greater force, then the angry single assertion of the Bishop of *Ossory*, we will shew him how far we will be parties to the injury of bringing in a rival pretension to that of his holiness, in being Antichrist. But our Adversary tells us, and we see it plainly in every period he writes, *that Religion is not his Calling*; and adds, *that his pains is saved in writing about Religion, because I magisterially tell what mine own is, without defending it; and no otherwise disprove him, then by wrong stating it*: that is, give an account of both the one and the other, from the authentick writings of each; therefore *he entreats the good Reader never to believe such a detractor, &c.* How far his Petitions may be prevalent in lieu of Arguments, I shall not determine, but offer a more just request unto the Reader, that he believe neither of us; but look to matter of Fact, and the reasons alledged by both, and only believe himself: for under our Authors favour, notwithstanding his peremptory asseveration; I neither assume to my self, nor desire to have given me, the privilege of being an *Interpreter* or a *Judge*. And so for the present, the Idolatry of the Mass, the sacrilege of robbing the Laity of half the Sacrament, and all the holy Scriptures; the addition of new Articles to the Creed, the praying to Saints, and adoration of Images, with the other abominations of that Church, are upon our Authors Passport, to march off in peace.

He

He advances next to the fourth Paragraph of my Discourse, and by his dextrous method of dispatch, confutes the whole Section; which from unquestionable History, and downright matter of Fact, the writings of the most celebrated Authors of the *Roman* Profession, the Bulls of Popes, and Canons of Councils admitted by the Church of *Rome* for universal, demonstrated how destructive Popery is to the interest of Kings and their Governments, by gravely calling in for Umpires *Solon* and *Lycurgus*; who, he says, would expect that Protestant Princes should after this fair story, abound in all affluence and power, and live longer than *Neslor*, whilst those of the *Catholick* Model, are but Tenants at will to the Pope, &c. Here our Author, if there be any sense in what he says, supposes that Protestant Princes cannot suffer any harm from Papists by the one privilege of their having thrown off the Papal yoke, and that no sickness or accident is to have liberty to kill where his Holiness spares. But by our Authors good leave, *Solon* and *Lycurgus* would make no such inferences, should they by a Poetick Fiction, or if you please (for 'tis the same thing) by a Popish miracle, be revived, and enjoyned a Pilgrimage to these Western parts of *Europe*, they would have seen a Protestant Prince in *France*, amidst the solemnities of his marriage, entertained with the massacre of 30000 of his Friends and Servants, his own Bedchamber not being an Asylum, the Butchery committed in cold blood in a time of Peace, and begun in the dead of night; against not only the expectation, but also the solemnest promises of security; so that at once were violated all Laws of Nations, Nature, and Religion, all those genial and hospitable Rites which were held sacred by the most barba-

Mefer. in An.
1571.

A Reasonable Defence

barbarous of Heathens, by a new prodigy of cruelty sent forth into the World for the propagation and glory of the *Roman* Catholick Faith; which Act, notwithstanding all its guilt and horror, became the publick exultation, not only of the Court of the Catholick King: but the sacred Conclave of his Holiness, and above all, his Holiness himself. They would have seen the self same Prince not only assaulted in the Field by open violence, but attempted in his person, and that more then once by his loyal *Roman* Catholick Subjects; and when he had quitted his Religion, and hoped for more security; at last destroyed by the desperate hand of one of that Churches Votaries. Or if the before mentioned *Solon* and *Zycurgus* had gone forward to the *British* Islands, they would have there beheld a Protestant Queen pursued with greater fury by her Popish Subjects; scarce a year of her long reign past without some new attempt upon her life by War, by Dagger, or by poison. And had they staid for some time with us; they would have seen her Successour designed to death with his Royal Family, his Nobility and Senate, the representative Power, and real strength of his whole Realm, by a strange *compendium* of ruine, all of them in one short moment to be destroyed by the perpetually loyal *Roman* Catholick Saints and Subjects of his Kingdom. After all, though the case be plainly thus, our good man *appeals to experience the truest informer of mankind*, and to make out an incontrollable proof of the greatness and security of Popish Princes, he points out to one nameless King of Spain, and one as nameless King of France, and so proportionably (that is some one of) the Papal Princes ranting like the Grand Seignior, if they please in their own Dominions, &c. When, or how it pleases these

*Cambel. Eliz.
Speed, Baker,
&c.*

these Monarchs to rant, we are not told; nor what comes of ranting (if his Holiness chance to be concerned in it) at the long run. We will suppose the ranting King of *Spain*, whom he means, may be *Charles* the V. for he we know made bold to imprison the old Gentleman; but in the mean time there was very little ranting in the case. The Emperour sadly complains of the misfortune to his neighbour Princes, and in his own Dominions orders solemn Prayers and Masses to be said every where, for his rescue and delivery; and when all was done in good sober earnest was content to knock under the Table, and marry his daughter to his Holinesses Nephew, *Alexander Medicis*. But there is one more circumstance which should not be concealed from our Author; that if *Charles* the V. was able to master the Pope, it was by the strength of an honest *German* Army, consisting almost wholly of Protestants. And therefore thus far we see no great exploit done by the *Spanish* ranting against the Pope. Let us see next whether the *French* be more lucky Hectors. The sturdiest that I know, was *Philip* the IV. who when *Boniface* the VIII. had wrote an insolent Letter to him, directs an answer as follows: '*Philip* by the Grace of God King of the *French*, to *Boniface* bearing himself as Pope, little health, or none at all;

'Let your great Foolship understand that in Temporal affairs we are subject to no man, &c. But praise at parting, he that was so hot at hand, was not long after cold in the mouth: For though he had the luck to escape the thunder of Pope *Boniface's* Bulls, (who excommunicated him, released his Subjects from their allegiance, and gave his Kingdom to the first occupant) and what is more, took him Prisoner

*Hist. Coune.
Trent, p. 44.
Spandan. in
Anna 1529.*

*Spand. ibid.
Miser. Anna
1529.*

Spand. ibid.

*Miser. An. 1303
&c.*

A Reasonable Defence

ner at *Anagnia*; yet after four days durance, the Burgers beat the *French* out of their Town, and gave the Old Gentleman an opportunity to go in peace to *Rome*; where though soon after he died, and thereby releas'd the King from that personal quarrel, yet was the Survivor fain to make fair weather with his Successors in *St. Peters Chair*, *Benedict II.* and *Clement V.* to the latter of whom he did the honour to lead his Mule by the Bridle; for which complement he had like to have paid very dear, being hurt by the ruine of the Wall at *Lions*, near which they pass'd, as was his Brother *Charles*: yet they escap'd better then the Duke of *Britanny* and the Popes brother, who were killed in the service. But after many troubles, he himself was rid by the Popes Legates, who drew him to make a most dishonourable Peace with the revolted *Flemmings*, and perished by an untimely death; having before he left the World, the grief of being the last of his Family, and of seeing his three daughters, by Judicial Process, openly convicted of Adultery; and lastly, to find himself the most hated and abominated person in his whole Kingdom. It were very easie to instance in some other Kings of *France*, who have taken the liberty to speak big, upon the confidence of the liberties of the *Gallican Church*; particularly *Henry III.* excommunicated first, and after murdered by *James Clement* a Monk. Which Fact *Sixtus Quintus* then Pope, commended in the Consistory, as a rare, noble, and memorable deed; a Fact done not without the providence and appointment of God, &c. But we shall ever find that the Pope hath still met an opportunity to cut their recurrent nerves, and spoil their ranting: leaving a more durable triumphal Pillar in memory of his Victories over *France*, then that

that which was lately raised in Rome to its dishonour.

After this very long and equally insignificant discourse, our Author makes a conscience of troubling Solon or Lysurgus, or his Reader, to travel beyond the Seas for examples of the splendour and greatness of Popish Princes, and refers us to Henry the VIII. who was esteemed over all the World ten times more considerable before, then after his revolt from Rome, &c. All the World is a large Word, and soon said by our Author: that comprehensive Theatre for men, will I fear scarce ever be of the same mind with this most improbable Doctor.

In the mean time if there was any decay in that Princes Reputation or Interest toward the end of his Reign, an accident which happens to almost every Monarch in his declining Age, Persons as wise every whit as our Author, have assigned very different causes of it, from what is by him produced, As 1. The removal of *Wolsey*, 2. The incumbrances which his frequent Marriages and Divorces brought him; And 3. (what it would have become our Author to have thought of,) the Thunderbolt of the Capitoline Jupiter, the Bull of Paul III. followed by a dangerous Rebellion in *Lincolnshire*, where 20000 men were in Arms against him. This seconded by another of double the number in the North; followed by a third, fourth, and fifth: and if he that had so much work cut him out at home, was not at leisure to appear much abroad, we know who is to be thanked for it.

Herbert Baker;
&c.

But our Author closes this Section, by saying, *that nothing can be so ridiculous, as the foolish pretence of his Adversary, that the persons of our Princes are safer then under Popery; whom every body knows that since the Reformation there have been but three Protestant Kings, and that all of*

A Reasonable Defence

them are reputed to have come to violent and extraordinary deaths. To gratifie our Author, I will shew him something more ridiculous by far; even his own dearly beloved Argument. For, not to insist on what is intimated before, that his Holiness has not the Keys of Death, though he pretend to those of Heaven, and his own Kitchen, Purgatory; and men may go out of the World, though not sent upon his errand, I will offer him a parallel Story. A person of his Church, very wise, and of great devotion, designs a Visit to our Lady of *Loretto*, his Friend tells him that the Passages are beset with Troops of *Bandetties*, who lately murdered a great Prince in his way thither, soon after killed another, then a third and a fourth, and so on, and attempted besides very many more, who hardly escaped their hands. No, says our Votary, this cannot be, for I knew three men that purposed to go thither, and two of them were poisoned in their Inn, and a third was murdered by his Servants, before his own doors. The Parallel is so evident, that I am sure, though our Author does not, every body else will comprehend it. I will not question our Author why only the three Protestant Kings are mentioned, and we hear nothing of his Adversary Queen *Elizabeth* in this account of our late Princes. He takes her it seems for a she *Nesler*, whom none of the attempts of his Party could rid out of the way. But then as to his observation of the poisoning of *Edward VI.* and King *James*, as it is plain, that were it true, 'tis nothing to the purpose; so, as luck would have it, 'tis utterly false; our Historians either not mentioning the suggestion, or at the same time they do so, confusing it. The Fable of the *Nosegay* and *Black Plaster* being fitted for such weak persons that have used their

Galwin in
Edw. p. 153.
Halix, &c.
B. R. cont. of
Martin, p. 363.

their understandings to submit to Tales and Legends, or such malicious ones, who tell a lie first, and then make it an Argument why they should be Rebels: and we cannot but remember of what particular use the story of the Black Plaister was in the last War. The best on't is, notwithstanding all *Romish* Designs both in *Scotland* and in this Nation, taking in the *Gunpowder Treason* into the bargain, King *James* lived to a fair Age, and sober men will not wonder if an Ague at that critical season, without the help of a Plaister, could kill him. Surely in this Argument it would have been expected from our Author, to have controled my allegations, and shewed that none of those persons, who I say were destroyed or ill handled by Popes, were so dealt with; and that all the Bulls that I produced are forgeries. But this meek Reasoner hath a fairer expedient, and tells us, *That he for his part lays not such abominations to the charge of any Religion, but to the pravity of humane nature; which is also the cause that his Party is so abused by the Unprincipled Incendiary,* meaning my self, *for were I not wicked in the highest degree, I would never have grounded any argument upon the vices and scandals of Popes, when I know their Infallibility is no Article of Faith amongst Papists.*

Well-fare a man that writes Controversie without a grain of Logick. He is very kind however in the first place, to let me know, whether I will or not, what the learnedest Doctors of the Church of *Rome* are far from understanding, that the Popes infallibility is not matter of Faith among them. But to wave this, and behold the quintessence of Demonstration, my Author *for his part lays no such abominations to the charge of any Religion,* therefore nobody else must. Therefore the Papists are abused by the *Unprincipled Incendiary,* who

A Reasonable Defence

who sets down plain matter of Fact. And again, the Popes of *Rome* are not infallible; therefore it is safe and eligible to submit unto their yolk, though they are never so tyrannous and debauched. *We are no more bound to believe the Pope unerrable, then is the Chancellor of France, or any Lieutenant Criminal of Paris that the King can do no wrong;* therefore it is still safe to submit to the Papacy, &c.

Once more our Author, and somebody else that would be nameless, *Abominate the Popes ill actions, as they admire their good ones; and cannot but think that all Christians ought to be subject to these Prelates in spirituals:* Therefore every one besides, must be as good natured as they, and be enslaved to him in his spiritual and temporal tyrannies. Whoever hath use of a Rope of Sand, let him apply himself to this Artist, for certainly the World cannot shew his fellow in tacking incoherent things together.

Accordingly he goes on and takes me to task for quoting Bellarmine, Suarez, Turrecremata, Perron, &c. *who say, that the Pope may depose Kings, and for inferring thence the danger of that Religion which teacheth these Doctrines.* Here a solemn appeal is made, *Is not this, Reader, urged like the man of Paris I ever took him for?* Well, It seems all Readers knew what opinion the worthy Answerer always had of the Author of the *Seasonable Discourse*: but I hope before we part, they will not be to seek what opinion they are to have of him, and the Religion he defends. In the next words he says, *I will cut my own throat, do what one can to hinder it.* This is proved by another appeal, *For did not all the Bishops of England that were consulted with, except one, declare to his Majesty, that he might lawfully comply and assent to my Lord of Straffords death, &c.* This shall not yet make me say, that

that our Protestant Doctrine teaches Murder, or that acting against conscience for humane advantage is warrantable, though the opinion of so many Prelates is, comparatively more considerable to the English Church, than a thousand to the Catholick. It is truly very much he should not make the inference he talks of, for it would be in all points as good as any he hath hitherto produced: but we must follow him in his own way. Where, first, upon hearing this Story as he tells it, one would think that a Synod of all the Bishops of the three Kingdoms had been convened, when alas the total sum amounted but to five persons in all; and the question was not what our Author falsely sets it: But to use Mr. H. L' Esrange his words (which generally the Writers of K. Charles I. life, exactly accord with.) 'The Bishops were only to resolve, whether the King might, his Conscience entire, pass the Bill against the Earl. The Bishops determine thus, That the matters of Fact and Law, were to stand apart; for the first, his Majesties presence at all the proceedings might enable him to pass his judgment: and if his judgment informed him that the Earl was guiltless, he might not in conscience condemn him. For the last being matter of Law, what was Treason, what not, the Judges they said were obliged by their Oaths to direct him. This was the total result of their joint opinions. There was indeed a Writing put into his Majesties hand by the Bishop of Lincoln, but what the contents thereof were, he never imparted to his other associates.

And now let the World judge, if all the Bishops of England, except one, &c. teach Murder to be lawful, or that acting against Conscience for humane advantage was warrantable: when of the whole Order there was but one single

Ham. L' E-
srange, p.
165. &c.
Perench. p. 15.

A Reasonable Defence

single person who can reasonably be imagined to have promoted the Earl of *Straffords* death. What is suggested by the Author concerning the Archbishop of *Armagh*, is a great and manifest calumny; as appears from the very particular account of that transaction inserted into the History of *Sir Will. Sanderson*; and might be farther evidenced by uncontrolable proofs, if there were need of them.

After this unsuccessful attaque upon the Bishops, our good man hath somewhat as little to the purpose to say to the Lawyers: *Do we not find that several of our learned Lawyers have affirmed that this or that was a Prerogative of the Crown, when other as learned have told us the quite contrary? Yet the Law of the Land is not to be called false, &c.* Now from the Premises it is to be concluded, *that I will cut my own throat, do what one can to hinder it.* It seems a little difference in Opinion concerning some branch of the Prerogative; is to be put in balance with dethroning and murdering of Kings: and the judgment of a Lawyer or two, hath the same influence on the consciences of men, as the resolution of so many probable Doctors in concurrence with his Holiness, who have in every Age filled *Europe* with confusion and blood.

Not to trouble us more in this matter, our Author at last comes to an issue, and according to his confident manner, says, *In short, Reader, were these Schoolmen, which our Adversary mentions now alive, they would tell us, that every body that pleased, might reject their fancies.* Good God, What kind of men were Cardinal *Bellarmino*, *Perron*, and the rest! who handle points that concern the lives of Kings, the interest and duty of whole Kingdoms; where if there be an errour, it engages to Rebellion, Treason, Parricide, and other the most
enor-

enormous crimes that can be acted; and yet these are such trifling *fanfies*, that the Authors are not concerned whether they be admitted or rejected; though they have declared them also to be *de fide*. Whereas 'tis added that *Mariana's* Book was burnt, we can tell also where 'twas not; nay where it and all of that stamp, even *Sanctorellus* himself, who to prove the Popes power in deposing Kings, urges the Text of the Apostle in the very contradictory to what he said, that it was to edification and also to destruction. If this be news to our Author, he may have it more at large in *St. Amours* Journal, and also see the opinion not of a few Doctors, but the whole Senate of Inquisitors, that the denial of the execution of the Popes Jurisdiction in the temporal Territories of Princes, without they give leave, is Heresie.

St. Amours,
P. 129.

Page 443.

As to his shrinking these high flown Writers to 10 or 12, when all the World knows that *Bellarmino* reckons up 72. and others rise to much higher numbers; if the issue be put to number, so that what side most Writers are of, shall pass for the Doctrine of the *Roman* Church, we will not decline the issue, notwithstanding the Musters of *Father Carron*, and the Author of the Controversial Letters.

After all these misadventures, our Author hath the confidence to make another appeal to his Reader, and tell him, that he sees how little my allegations either from the practises of Popes, or writings of a few Doctors made against the Papists, make against them; since the Author and some other disown those opinions, &c. The Reader does abundantly see what hath been said on both sides, and will be sure never to take inferences from his hands, who hath so ill luck at them. But I pray if the claim and prescription of 600 years, I mean, ever since the days

C

of

A Reasonable Defence

of *Hildebrand*, and the Writings of the most celebrated Doctors in all that time signify nothing, to evidence the danger of Popery; because forsooth this does not speak the Doctrine of the Church; what is replied to the determinations of Oecumenical Councils where his Holiness presided? I hope if the Infallibility be not vested in the Doctors, nor the Pope, nor Councils apart; yet if any thing be declared in a General Council with the concurrence of the Pope, this will pass for the Doctrine of the Church; unless perchance the new Scheme in behalf of the Nurses and Mothers have utterly supplanted the Authority of the Fathers of the Church. In proof hereof the *Seasonable Discourse* produces the Council of *Lateran*, of *Lyons*, and of *Constance*, all which are allowed for General. But to this our prudent Answerer says not one single word, and betakes himself to his old Topick of the loyalty of his Party; concerning which since he will have it so, let him expect his answer from the rejoinder of the Antiapology.

Our Author having run himself out of breath in his zeal to his loyal Party, comes next to tell me, *that I need not have troubled my self with the ungrateful Topick of the Popes Excommunicating and Deposing Kings, seeing Popish Princes fear as little the loss of their Dominions as the Protestants; and that I (senseless as I am) know that ever since the Reformation, the Pope hath given away but two Kingdoms, England and France, which thanks be to God belong still to the owners, whilst those that call themselves Protestants have deposed the absolute Princes of Scotland, Denmark, Sweden, &c.* In the first place I do not think our Author hath been admitted to the Cabinet Council of either Popish or Protestant Princes, to know what they do, or do not fear. And, Secondly, 'Tis
an

an inference very worthy our Author to conclude, such a mischief is not feared, therefore there is no danger, when every body, besides our Author, knows that no ruine is so fatall as that which is contemned and overlooked. But the following inference is more remarkable, *the Pope hath done all that in him lies, to disvest the Kings of France and England of their Dominions, yet by Gods blessing they hold them still*; therefore there is no danger from the Pope. Further yet, *Some that call themselves Protestants have been guilty of Rebellions*; therefore the Church of England, who both in her Principles and Practices is confessedly free from any such disorders, is equally guilty of them. And lastly, what suits exactly with the rest, *Matthew Paris and other Catholicks, complain of the intolerable tyrannies of the Pope*; therefore 'tis a fault in us to complain of them: or, which follows as well, those tyrannies are very fit for us to call upon our selves, when by Gods blessing we are freed from them.

Now at last we have attended our Author to the end of his second head. After some scorn of my *Politicks*, he addresses to them, forgetting to say one syllable in defence of putting whole Nations under interdict; that they who happen to displease his Holiness, should have no publick Offices of Religion for several years together; this our *Pull Answerer* slides by in silence, and arrives, as he sayes, to his *Politicks*. And first he destroys my profound Observation (Pag. 18.) *that says Popery will be destructive to the Laws of the Land*. This he laughs out of countenance, by saying that the *Lawyers* are very good Catholicks already, *for they declare that the King, and by parity of reason, the Pope, &c. can do no wrong*; that their Common Law is oral Tradition, that an unknown tongue is fit and laudable; that Clients must pay

A Reasonable Defence

blind obedience. But since a *Rowland for an Oliver* is the word ; I must beg leave to add one maxime of Law more, The King never dies, and therefore never any Papist murdered any King, or ought to be punished for attempting what was in it self an impossibility. But our merriment is upon the sudden turned into fury ; *who can have patience*, says our meek Reasoner, *with this piece of formality, that durst urge such a foolish insignificant argument, that Popery will prejudice our Law and Lawyers, when as not only they, but all that can read, know what learned rich and eminent persons, both for power and dignity, we have had formerly of this Profession : the like at present being seen in France, Spain, Italy, and other places, &c.* It is a hard matter to deal with a man who will bear one down, and perswade him against the most evident truths in the World. There is scarce an ordinary School-boy, who does not know that most of the Judicatories of *England* were, till the Reformation, commonly in the hands of Priests and Canonists ; and that when ever Popery comes in, it will probably be so again. However it is most manifest that the greatest part of the Grist will be carried to another Mill ; first the Ecclesiastical Courts at home, and then by appeals to *Rome* abroad. I can with very little recollection at any time reckon up about twenty Earls, Viscounts, and Barons, which since the time of King *Henry VIII.* threw off the Pope, (excluding the interval of *Q. Mary's* reign) were raised to the Peerage of *England* from the Law ; and I can reckon up hundreds, who have gained estates thereby, which might qualifie them for the like dignity. But I have not in all History met with one instance of that strange secret which our Author tells us is known to *every one that can read*, of rich and eminent persons to be set in balance with the other.

other. But he proves his Paradox by the greatness of the *French, Spanish, and Italian* Lawyers; a point which I have no reason at all to grant him, but only because if it were true, it proves nothing at all to the purpose: for quietness sake it shall be, for once, as he pleases. But the Argument runs thus; The Civil and Canon Lawyers are great men abroad under Popery, therefore the Common Lawyers of *England* will be so too. The Gentlemen of the Long Robe, who upon the double obligation of their Country and Profession, are the assertors of the Laws of *England*, are not so foolish as to desert their interest and duty upon those lamentable pretences that are here offered. And therefore I shall no longer insist upon this head, but proceed to the following.

Where my Adversary undertakes to confute, that is, derides and rails against my second wise Observation, (p.20.) that *Popery will resume all the Lands alienated since the Reformation from the Church*. Whether my observations be to be called wise or foolish, is, I hope, to be determined by somewhat besides our Authors pleasure; who appears, and no body can help it, secure and unconcerned at the mention of *resumption of Church Lands*. We will not suppose him thus unconcerned because he hath not much to lose, and therefore impute it to his confidence of obtaining such advantages, in case of a change, as may abundantly recompence him. We know very well that such considerations prevailed with some men about the time of his Majesties restauration, and may as well in any other revolution. The Pope, he tells us, *is not such a child, as to give a thing and take a thing*; whether the old Gentleman may not, at least in this particular, be twice a child, we are not secure by our Authors assertion; espe-

A Reasonable Defence

especially since another sort of persons besides Ideots and Infants, meddle with things which belong to them. And were not our Author furnished with a convenient talent of incogitancy, he could not but know how in all Ages Popes have done so: usurped not only on the Estates of private men, and Dominions of Princes, (and, not to go for instances beyond those which were before his eyes in the *Seasonable Discourse*, where he finds his Majesties Dominions disposed of several times over) but on the acts of preceding Popes; the doing which is justified by as good Canon Law as is to be found in the Decretals. Instance in that which occurs next, where his Holiness breaking through the Decree of a Council, and his Predecessors to boot, declares peremptorily, 'That though the *Lateran* Council and Pope *Alexander* had decreed a nullity to be in the Acts there specified, yet the power of dispensing is not taken from the succeeding Pope, since that could not be intended by them, who could not prejudice the right of the Successor, who was to have the same power that the other had: and it is a known rule that *par in parem imperium non habet*. If the Act of a preceding Pope could bind the Successors, I fear me, 'twould go but ill with our Lay-Abbots; for Pope *Symachus* is very positive, that it shall not be lawful for the Pope to alienate the Lands of the Church in any manner, or for any necessary: but the Gloss sets all straight again, and says, that the Successor is not bound, it being certain that no mortal can judge the Pope. So that I doubt our Author has not divined aright, what the Popes opinion of his obligation would be, in case of a revolution: yet however, without intending it, he hath told us his own; by his *Story of Mrs. Ven: viz.* that the possessors of Church Lands

Cap. instituit nobis, de electione, & electione.

Causes non licet, l. 1. c. 1.

Lands have no better right, then Mrs. *Ven* had to a Cavaliers Estate; and how well Mrs. *Ven* kept hers, 'tis not hard to be informed.

But our Author tells us, *such a resumption must be either by Act of Parliament, or by the Pope: an Act of Parliament cannot be had, and the Pope will not do it: the latter, the Popes good will, we have seen how far it is to be depended on; the former part our Author fortifies with this reason, that it will be against the interest of all the members, to pass such an Act.* It falls out unfortunately for our Author to write in an Age where revolutions have furnished matter of Fact; which is a pestilent Argument of the possibility of an event; only those that are armed with infallibility having confidence enough to deny, that what hath been, may be. Having therefore an eye to what hath passed heretofore, let us examine this grand security our Author gives the Lay Abbots from the interest of the members of Parliament not to consent to a restitution to Holy Church.

First of all, what certainty have we that the Members of Parliament, upon such a revolution, shall be all or most chosen out of Lay Abbots? did we find the late Purchasers, or that sort of men, carry so many elections in the choice of this present Parliament, which was as free and uncontroled as any ever was, or will be? or did we rather find that the humour of the People went quite against that sort of men? Yet farther, What if upon such a revolution as must be supposed if Popery should once prevail in this Kingdom, none should be eligible but under certain qualifications? The late Times furnished us with one of fearing God, and hating covetousness, which interpreted by a *Roman* Casuist, might easily be brought to signify

signifie such as had not, or would not retain Church Lands. If those terms be not expressive enough, new ones would not be long in finding, to take the place of the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy at the Parliament dore, which upon such a change must avoid.

What if one should desire the Author to consider, that many ways may be found out to prevail with the most eminent and leading men? Besides that, the zeal in delivering up Church Lands will so recommend them to those that shall be then in power (and who those may be, God knows) that it will be like the merit of an old Cavalier at the Kings restauration, qualifying them for all the good things of the Land.

What if one should farther desire the Author to call to mind, that the long Parliament it self, at the last when they saw the humour of the Nation run toward it, were plainly desirous, and contriving to bring in the King? (I mean when the secluded Members were amongst them) though there was not one man there who had not forfeited his neck by the Law of the Land, (and that is as sensible an interest as Abbey Lands) and yet the Kings good words, the humour of the Nation leading toward it, and the hope of meriting by being of the forwardest, made many men not only suffer it, but by opposing the Faction then in possession, run some hazards to promote the Kings restauration. He that shall peruse our Records and Acts of Parliament, will find that every Faction, when prevailing, hath had no great difficulty to get Laws made for their purpose.

Those Lay Abbots, who will prevent Acts for resuming Church Lands, must in their several capacities use their endeavour to prevent the growth of Popery
in

in the Nation. If once that over-spread this Kingdom, it is beyond folly to rely on the Acts of Parliaments under which they now claim.

Our Author, for our farther security, tells us the Pope gave consent to alienate Lands at Venice for the War against the Turk, and for an end he supposes not unlike it the settling a distracted Kingdom, dispensed with it here also. The Lay Abbots are obliged to him for putting the alienation of Church Lands here upon an equal foot with those at Venice. It is the first time I have ever heard any of that Religion give so great an approbation of it: and yet even in this kindness of his, there is a latent sting; he doth not mean that the first alienation had the Popes allowance, he speaks only of what the Pope consented to in *Q. Maries* days, as he calls it, (*i. e.*) reclaiming a distracted, *i. e.* in their sense, an heretical Kingdom. When the *Seasonable Discourse* doubts whether, that not having the effect, for which it was designed, it will not be interpreted a condition not accepted of, and therefore no longer obligatory. Our Author answers only by his censure, which he is pleased to bestow on it, as a transcendent confidence to alledge as an instance that there remains no obligation from the Kings offer at the Isle of Wight, to lease Church Lands for 99 years, since not accepted, as certainly no offer obliges unless accepted. He is pleased to say with some derision, that none but the Author of the *Seasonable Discourse* fancies the Pope cannot be tied to an agreement as well as other Governours. The *Seasonable Discourse* had told him, that the Pope acting for the Church, would in a favourable conjuncture, find himself obliged to rescind whatever had passed prejudicial to it; the impossibility whereof, I do not find him demonstrate: and I have shewed him as good Canon Law as is in the

Decretals, that the Pope can be loose from this Act of his Predecessors, had it been more formal then it was, whenever he pleased. But my good man brings up his reserve of the *Treaty of Munster*, upon which so many Papist and Protestant Princes, Noblemen, and Gentlemen, have either Bishopricks, Abbeyes, or the like, confirmed to them by the Pope. But if after all this there be no such matter, if the Pope have been so far from confirming these grants, as to protest against them by his Legate Cardinal *Cheigi* in the Treaty; and afterwards in a particular Bull damned them to the Pit of Hell: what shall we say to the honesty and credit of our Author, with his impertinent Broadside from the *Maltese Gallies*? But (not to insist on our Authors customary frailty of being mistaken) as to our present business, suppose the Popes equally obliged with other Governors, I do not find the Author hath answered any thing to those words, in *Pag. 21. of Season. Disc. 5 Acts* 'of Resumption are not things unheard of in ours, or 'in foreign Stories. Nor to the instance of the present *French Kings* method of resuming the Demesnes of his Crown, *p. 22.* no contemptible Argument of fear to the Lay Abbots, since our Author does not pretend the Pope more easily or more strongly to be tied then other Governors. The Glance he is pleased to give at the Fee-farm Rents, however intended by him, furnisheth a pregnant argument how doubtful men are of the title to alienations of that nature (though purely lay without any scruple or pretence of Sacriledge by any body) since it is evident that whilst they were exposed to sale for ready money, scarce any would deal for them, and they remained unfold, till the method of doubling orders, did a little help; but that which made men earnest indeed

to

*Instrum. Pacis.
Notitia rerum
Imperii Roma-
no Germanici
per Phil. Aud.
Borgoldensem.
P. 91. 6
Innocentii X.
Declaratio mol-
liti articulo-
rum super pa-
cis Germanicis,
etc. ex Typogr.
reuerenda Ca-
mera. Apostol.
Anno, 1651.*

to buy them, was the stop upon some of his Majesties other payments, which made men to resort to this as the most eligible in this conjuncture; which I suppose may have been the greatest inducement to those Princes he is pleased to speak of in *Germany*, to accept of a settlement of their Church Revenues, as the best terms they could at that time obtain; though they were to undergo all the Curses of Pope *Innocent X.* Bull, particularly against them, and all the studied execrations of the *Bulla Cœna*, that most solemn and devout preparative among the *Romanists* for the charities of Easter; and the Decree and command of the Council of *Trent*, *Seff. 25. c. 20.* 'establishing all the 'sacred Canons, all General Councils, together with 'other Apostolical Ordinances, (that is, Bulls of 'Popes,) made in favour of Ecclesiastical persons, and 'Ecclesiastical liberty, and against the violators 'thereof, &c. The easiest effect whereof to those of the *Roman* Communion, must be the paying a round fine at every absolution; and at the time of death being awed with the terrors of Purgatory, till a liberal sacrifice to the Popes Coffers, promise a release from his Holinesses Kitchen. I desire this Decree of the holy and Oecumenical *Council of Trent* last mentioned, may be well weighed and considered; for if all Bulls in favour of Ecclesiastical persons and liberty be here established; and none of these Orders were founded, but by Priviledges and Bulls from the Pope; one need not make much scruple what will become of these Parliament Acts which vacated them, so soon as a fair opportunity of declaring in the case shall present it self.

But farther yet, Supposing the Pope equally tied with other Governours, may he not plead that the

A Reasonable Defence

Law doth relieve the King against his own Act, when he hath been deceived in his grant, obtained by undue suggestions. 'Tis not to be doubted, but if Popery should prevail, his Holiness would expect the same equity of our Law; and I believe the Lay Abbots do not desire to put their Estates to that issue before a Jesuited Jury, whether the Pope were deceived in his Concessions in *Q. Maries* days. The points in Law which may rise from the penning the Acts of Suppression of Religious Houses, intimated in the *Seasonable Disc.* our Author, according to his way of full answering, fairly passes over.

My next misdemeanour, for which I am to have due correction, is my quotation of a *passage in the Traicte Politique*, which after a great deal of insipid contumely that was intended for wit, and fills up the room of sense, is not at all pretended to be misrecited by me; only I am first very *ridiculous to think the Interest of the Regulars so considerable a thing*. Well, since it must be so, and I am never to be believed, let us take the opinion of *Campanella* in the case, as good a Politician I dare say as our Author is likely to be in haste. 'If (says he) all Princes with their People should join their forces to destroy the Poppedom, they would never be able to compass it. Let him but set out a Crusade, all the Religious, of which there are many millions, would all run to arms, able to resist and terrifie the whole World with their Tongues and Swords. But should we take them for meer Abby-lubbers, that had much rather eat then fight, 'tis plain to every man of sense, what interest they have in setting on others that have better Metal: not to tell of their dexterities in poisoning and stabbing, by that compendium superseding the use of War and Armies.

But

But secondly, As to the absurd Parallels of the *Hugonots* and the *Mogul*, out of which our Chymist in reasoning draws a plain Conclusion, that *I have ruined the Church, and am a Traitor*, 'tis such a piece of childish folly, that in meer respect to the Reader, I will not expose him for it. Let any honest man that hath not travelled himself out of his Religion and Wits, and love of his Country, seriously read the Section referred to by me; and freely judge whether it be that unconcerning piece of Nonsense 'tis represented.

Our Author after this calls me to account for my *third Observation which stirs up my zeal against Popery, The preservation of Trade, with the value of Lands and Rents*. It cannot be denied but the Author hath given good evidence of his skill, when he comes to examine the arguments of inconvenience to Trade, Rents, and Riches of the Nation, supposed to follow the admission of Popery: but the dexterity lies in knowing what he could not answer, and so diverting the Discourse to another subject: For example, It was objected that the encouragement Popery gave to idle persons by Monasteries, &c. would withdraw many hands from Work and Trade. The Author to prove this false (as if he were playing at Cross purposes) tells us, *some have affirmed Deanaries, Prebendaries, &c. did so also*. Doth that make the objection any thing less true? none can deny, but if all the hands in *England* were employed in working, more work might be done: And if for other good reasons it is found fit to set apart some for other uses, Judges, States-men, Divines, &c. doth it therefore follow it is good to have a refuge for all the lazie People in a Nation to be idle in, without being any way useful, much less necessary to the publick? But if the Reader find not
that

A Reasonable Defence

that argument convincing, he hath plenty of others as good, so the number shall supply for the weight; for to prove that Monasteries do not withdraw hands from Work and Trade, he tells you, *many Protestants have and do lament the want of them: Ergo. That Mr. Stow saith it was a pitiful thing to hear the Lamentation in the Country for them, when they were put down: Ergo.* But who do you think lamented them? Probably, those who by their suppression were forced to work and take pains for their living, which before they did not.

The Author of the *Seasonable Discourse* had unfortunately overshot himself, and said, That he thought the Celibate of Priests, and the admitting Nuns and Religious Orders would be an hindrance to the increase in People: the Answerer convinceth him of his mistake by a Proverb, (I think of his own making) viz. *That nothing furnishes the Gallows and the Bawdy-houses like Parsons children:* Ergo, the Celibate, &c. doth not hinder the increase in People. His inferences are so lovely, that I can by no means pass them by. Certainly no body but our Author in an Age when several of the Nobility and prime Ministers of State, are and have been Sons of Clergy men: when the Sons of so many Earls and Barons, not to mention the Gentry, are actually in Holy Orders, and more in the Universities are Candidates of them: and on the other side, when persons of the vilest extraction, in the Church of *Rome* are notoriously known to have risen to be Cardinals and Popes: I say, no body besides our Author, would have objected the mean birth of our Clergy as a reproach unto us. I am sure no Christian, who is the Votary and Disciple of the blessed Jesus, who for our sakes made himself of no reputation, and put on

on the form of a Servant, and chose Fishermen and Tent-makers for his Apostles, would with despight and scorn (had the thing been true, as it is in the general very false) objected an humble Fortune or mean Birth to those who serve at his Altar, and succeed to his Apostles in their ministration in holy things. Had I my Authors eloquence in Exclamations, I might here cry out *on the Unprincipled man*. But to pass this, however here is an excellent effect of the marriage of the Clergy, which I did not before think of; they provide matter for the Exercise of Justice (which would else be quite out of use) and give sufficient supply to the Bawdy Howses, without laying a necessity on those of any other extraction to be debauched. How should one do to convince this Author that there were Whores and Thieves when Priests did not marry: or that there may be now of other extraction than Ministry. I shall not pretend to the privilege of making Proverbs: but I am sure it is become the vulgar observation, that the Whores and the Thieves almost of course seek an *Asylum* at Rome, whose first beginnings were owed to that sort of Inhabitants. If we should search Records of old time, to see what Thieves had been condemned or executed in those days, our Author has an answer for that too; for neither the Judges nor the Juries supposed to condemn them, were infallible; as he is pleased to say even of the Pope himself, when he finds an argument cannot be otherwise avoided; and the Reader will easily believe our Author thinks the Pope as infallible as a Free-holder at the least. Despairing therefore of convincing him by any arguments of mine, in this difficult point, I leave him to his own meditation resolving to comply with what he is pleased to say to
his

his Reader upon this very subject, *viz. that there is no need of staying longer upon it.* And yet lest he should think himself neglected, I am willing to offer a word or two to his observation of Popish Countries being as populous as the Reformed; in which, if circumstances be rightly considered, the Reader will find cause to differ from him. For he will scarce find a Popish Country of that extent so populous as *Holland* is, or lately was. If the Author think our want of People may be alledged on his side, it is to be considered that we have been for a long time wonderfully drained of our People by our Plantations, besides the Wars of *England*, *Scotland*, and *Ireland*, and the re-planting of *Ireland*, which the Author ought the less to forget, because we are obliged to those of his Church for the occasion of it.

As to his argument of taking away all days of rest, it will not follow, that because I allow it reasonable to pay Tithes, or Easter Offerings to the Clergy, therefore I should give them half or all my Estate; nor the other way, that because I will not give them all my Estate, therefore I should not pay Tithes. The moderation of many things makes them eligible, which the excess would render perfectly intolerable.

The next of our Authors dexterities is his eluding the argument used in the *Seasonable Discourse*, that Fasting days would be more numerous, and therefore less flesh eaten; and thence it was inferred, Cattle abounding would be cheaper, and therefore Farmers would not pay the same rent for Land, as if there were not so many Fasting days. Now our Authors full answer is, *Bishop Andrews in his Lenten Sermons commends Fasting, and so do many other Protestant Divines.* Therefore though there should be more Fasting

Fasting days, there would be as much Flesh eaten, &c.

It is unfortunate our Author did not light upon a right way of arguing at first; for if he had, it is probable he would have kept it up, as well as he hath done his cross purposes; in which being once engaged, he would not be so wavering as to depart from it. I dare not undertake for a Gentleman who thinks he follows an Infallible guide; otherwise I should have been tempted to give the Reader hopes, that when any body should write against the lawfulness of Monasteries, or of Priests continuing unmarried, of Holydays, or of Fasting, our Author would then give us his arguments of their convenience or inconvenience as to Trade, Rent, or increase of People: which he hath been pleased wholly to omit now, when that part only was in question. If *Spain*, which hath Plantations, be compared with us, we are much more populous, as we are also then *Italy* which hath none at all; 'Tis true *France* exceeds us, not having had that drain of Plantations, till of late; and that sparingly in respect of us; and possibly somewhat of the populousness of *France* may be owing to the Reformation, those of that Religion, furnishing no Nuns, Friars, or Orders of either Sex obliged to celibate. I have heard the *French* King hath had some consideration of suppressing some of the Religious Houses, and restraining the admission of persons into them upon this very account; whether it is become any thing more then a project, I cannot say.

The next thing is, the objection from Holy-days, as an hindrance to Trade and Work; but because I have the ill luck never to be believed by our Author, I will set down the very words of a devout Catholick, *J. Cam- ramuel*, and let the World judge whether I am that

Camuel
Furd. Theol.
5:15.11.

E

impu-

A Reasonable Defence

impudent affirmer I am represented. 'In the Count-
 'tries (saith he) subject to the King of *Spain*, besides
 'Sundays, and Festivals to our Lady, the Apostles and
 'other Saints, there are the peculiar Holy-days of
 'Cities and Thanksgivings for Victories, which are
 'so frequent as to take up a great part of the year.
 'Under the States there are no Holy-days besides the
 'Sundays. Now the Catholick and Heretick Cities
 'being close together, this I see and experiment every
 'day, that poor men who have a charge of Wife and
 'Children, cannot in four days gain enough to main-
 'tain their Wife and Families for seven; therefore
 'they run over to the Rebels, that getting more there,
 'they may live more advantageously and plentifully.
 'This removal occasions four necessary mischiefs:
 '1. The Catholick King loses his Subjects. 2. The
 'number of our Enemies is increased. 3. Our Ene-
 'mies are enriched, the Manufactures of our Run-
 'aways are sold to us, for which our money is sent into
 '*Holland*, who fight against us with it. 4. They turn
 '*Calvinists*. Thus he. And I think his words are a
 sufficient justification of mine. But our Author I ex-
 pect should say that Pope *Urban VIII.* in his Bull bear-
 ing date *Decemb. 22. 1642.* retrenches the number of
 Holy-days. He does so indeed, but under the soft
 terms of Holy-days of obligation universally to be ob-
 served; but even then, under our Authors correction,
 he retains *Holy-wood* day, the *Assumption of the blessed Vir-
 gin*, her *Birth*, *St. Laurence*, *St. Sylvester*, *St. Joseph*,
St. Anne, the *Guardian Saint* of the Kingdom, as also
 the *Patron* of the *City, Town, Parish*, which fall not with-
 in the number our Author pretends. But however,
 since notwithstanding Pope *Urban's* Bull, the old
 Troop of Saints, both real and imaginary, those I mean
 which

which are in Heaven, or Hell, or never were at all, (which notoriously is the case of some of them) remains in the *Roman Breviary*, after it has been reformed over and over by several Popes since the Council of *Trent* ; our Author must not blame the *Seasonable Discourse* (having been taught by him, that Popes Bulls are not to be urged in proof of the Doctrine of the Church ; and therefore will hardly Counterbalance Liturgies) though he had laid his charge to the most comprehensive extent : but surely 'tis most plain that my argumentation is firm and conclusive, That the increase of Holy-days, or the rigour of their observance, which is all one, is so far prejudicial to Trade, as there is an increase, whatever the proportion be. His story of the *Reverend man*, who would *mortifie in Capon, because he loved Fish better*, may when 'tis equally true, stand besides the parallel of one of his own Tribe ; who in great devotion to the Laws of the Church, dipt his forbidden flesh into the water, and by his *fat* (which we know of course works greater miracles) commanded it to go down Pig, and come up Pike ; and then with a good conscience fell to his Fish. Our Authors argument for the *employing Seamen*, will have no force in this matter, so long as it is known how many *Hollanders* fish upon our Coasts, and make a vast Revenue by it ; yet are under no other outward tie then that of frugality, to keep at any time a Fast, or feed on Fish.

Our Author goes on to my fourth Observation, *that Popery will bring to private persons a vast expence in Masses, Dirges, &c.* I expected that after the charge of so large a sum, our Author should have made use of his Talent of Confidence, and stoutly denied the allegation ; or at least, as he uses to do in a case of exigence,

A Reasonable Defence

put on the Buffoon and fairly laught it out. But he very honestly confesses the whole matter, and goes about to justify it, *because Magna Charta gives everybody leave to do what he will with his own.* Our Author hath the luck to surprize his Reader in every thing he says. There is not a Grand Jury man in *England* but knows that there are several scores of Statutes that restrain men from doing what they will with their own, and yet they were never till now charged with being a breach of *Magna Charta*; I would fain know (to wave other instances) if the Statute of *Mortmain*, which he presently mentions, do not induce such a restraint; and if that be a breach of *Magna Charta*. 'Tis a known rule in Law, that the Publick is concerned to take care that private men should well imploy their Estates; and all wise Nations have been concerned to appoint Guardians and Tutors to those whose weakness or prodigality made them ill managers for the Publick and themselves. And sure 'tis but an ill account of Popery, that it will put us under a perpetual nonage; and unless our Authors new maxim help, expose us to be begged for Fools and Idiots. His next argument to prove that Popery does not drain the purses of its Votaries, is that he believes the *Papists of England and elsewhere, have as much money in their purses at the years end, as their Protestant neighbours of the same rank and estate.* I desire this may be remembred at the next complaint of persecution. They are indeed shrewdly hurt by the tyrannous Hereticks, who crack in this manner, and offer to drop Ginneys with their Neighbours. But Sir, if Popery prevail; the burthensome offices, from which you are now exempted, will fall upon you as well as others; nor must you think to make your Priest your Caterer or Bailiff any longer,

ger, or put him off with a pitiful salary, raised out of Symony, which in this case his Holiness hath made lawful for you. The World, believe it, will be changed; his Holiness is now to stroke you, and shake his Provender; but if he gets up again upon his old patient Beast, which carried him and all the load he could heap on, for so many Ages; we must not doubt, and you with us, of having the same, if not worse usage then formerly we met.

When I had made out from unquestionable Records the intolerable oppressions and incredible sums of money, which in times of Popery were drained, and even screwed from us, I closed the Paragraph by desiring to be informed 'what was, or may be expected to come back in exchange to us, besides Parchments 'full of Benedictions and Indulgences; store of Leaden 'Seals, Beads, and Tickets, Medals, Agnus dei's, Rosaries, hallowed grains, and Wax Candles: These it seems our Author takes for very sufficient Barter; for he attempts not to name any one thing which is to be added to the Account.

He proceeds to my fifth Observation, p. 29. which nettles me when I think on't, 'tis *Auricular Confession*. And here he again wonders at the unprincipled man, and tells us, that Scripture commands it by these words, *confess your sins one to another*. There be some who would reply, that these words enjoin as much the Priest to confess his sins to the People, as the People to the Priest: But I will not discourage a young beginner from quoting the Scriptures, and therefore will by no means take the advantage of that exception: but will flatly tell him, that neither this Text, nor any other in the Bible, nor Canon of any ancient Council, Writing of Fathers, or practice of the Primitive Church gives the

A Reasonable Defence

the least countenance to Auricular Confession. For proof of this, because my credit is low with him, I shall desire my Author at his best leisure to look upon what is said in the known *Jansenist* Tract, *De la frequent Communion*, proving through the first Ages, that performance of the Penance did precede the Absolution: which *Tecarius* replying to, can only answer, that those instances were all in publick penitences: but is able to produce himself not one instance, whether of Confession or Penance where 'twas otherwise; which sufficiently shews that this present Engine of the *Romanists*, which gives Absolution before the performance of Penance, is a meer abuse and novelty in the Church. His excuse for the sacred seal of Confession in behalf of Princes, *that by this means Priests will dissuade and dehort all Subjects from traitorous machinations, which otherwise would be concealed from them*, is such a piece of confidence, as we could hardly meet elsewhere, but from our Author. For was it not as clear as noon-day light, that the whole design of the *Gunpowder Treason* was made known in Confession, and that Absolution was given upon it, and the Sacrament also in pursuance thereof: and for the keeping secret the whole matter, in respect of the Priest as well as the Conspirators? and was not this almost the only Plea which Father *Garnet* made at his arraignment, to justify himself for not disclosing the Conspiracy? when 'twas wickal notorious that his resolution of the case did not dehort or dissuade, but animate that hellish enterprise? The close of our Authors Apology is, *that Auricular Confession may be abused and prophaned, as is the reading of the Scriptures*. To which I answer, that the Parallel is not very mannerly or apposite; but yet it yields a very good argument *ad hominem*,

Proceedings
against the
late Traitors.

minem, The Papists, because the Scriptures may be abused, forbid the reading of them; therefore since, as 'tis notorious, Auricular Confession is more abused, let that be forbid likewise.

Our Author proceeds to my *short and dull glances against Indulgences* and Pardons; I never intended to convince by strains of wit or railing, that is our Authors privilege, the weapon which I use is plain and down-right truth, which he above all mankind that ever I yet met, hath reason to be angry with. His first charge is *my quoting Corn. Agrippa*; He may himself it seems, with a good grace quote Plays, and the Transproser, and Dr. *wild* the Poet, and Mr. *Pen* the Quaker, and transcribe whole Pages at a time; but the very naming *Cornelius Agrippa* is a mortal sin in me. Let him however read what *Naudam* hath said in his behalf; and then see whether he be to be put in the same form with *Rablais*. But I am farther accused of being *pleasantly, if not maliciously ignorant concerning the ancient rates mentioned by me of Fornication: which imposition the Reader must know, was only a pecuniary Mulet upon some transgressions, as we have here about swearing, &c.* God be thanked there is a Law against Swearing, 'twere much to be wished that there were some against Lying: since you will out-face me in every thing that I say, be it never so evident. I pray what think you of *Claud. Espenceau*? did he know what these your ancient godly impositions were? or will you have some deference to his opinion in the case? his words are these. 'There is a Book publicly set to every mans view, which goes off as well now as ever, entituled, *Taxa Cancellaria Apostolica*, which is exposed and prostituted as a common Whore for gain: whence more villany is learned then from all the In-

Situ-

*Com. in Epist.
ad Tit. cap. 1.
Digr. .: p. 67.*

A Reasonable Defence

'stitutions and Summaries of wickedness: there is li-
 'cense granted for many of the most abominable
 'crimes, and absolution for all, excepting such who
 'will not buy them. I forbear their names, they be-
 'ing (as one expresses it) horrid in their very sound.
 'It is strange that in these Times, in this Schism, that
 'Catalogue and Inventory of so many foul and abo-
 'minable Villanies, so infamous, that I verily believe
 'there is not a more scandalous Book in all *Germany*,
 'Switzerland, or any other place which hath separated
 'from the Church of *Rome*, is unsupprest. Yea, it is
 'so far from being supprest by the Treasurers of the
 'Church of *Rome*, that the Licences and impunityes
 'for those so many and horrible crimes, are renewed,
 'and for the most part confirmed by the faculties of
 'the Legates, &c. And now the Author may be
 pleased to rub his forehead a little, and with good
 confidence go on to tell his *Stories*, whether he made
 them himself, or *received them in Confession*, or heard
 them at the Coffee-house, 'twill make no great odds.
The reason, he says, why I am so piquant against Popes, Car-
dinals, &c. is out of madness to see that none of my Flock will
trust me with the news of a Gazette, and 'tis a common say-
ing, that if one would have a thing bruited abroad, 'tis but
telling it to the Parson as a secret, who will not fail of acquaint-
ing his wife, and she presently, the whole Parish with it. And
now if I should chance to have no Parish, nor no Wife,
 what a goodly argument would be here spoiled? Well
 Sir, the Friers and Popish Priests Concubine is as near
 his bosome, as the Protestant Priests Wife: and you
 know 'tis a more celebrated saying than that which
 you just now alledged, that the Priests have a Law
 forbidding them to marry, and a custome for not li-
 ving chaste. But in reserve comes in the *story of Simon*
More,

More, the Preacher to the Rebels at Worcester, who betrayed Hind the famous Robber: and he is set out as a Ghostly Father of the Church of England, and a sufficient reason why no body will unburthen his Conscience to any Priest of our Church: which suggestion, whether it have more malice or folly in it, I cannot easily resolve, but I am sure deserves no farther answer.

He goes on to the last Observation, which makes me his mortal enemy, p. 32. Self-preservation, to avoid Fire and Faggot, Assassines, Racks and Gibbets, the known methods by which the Romanists support their Cause, and propagate their Faith, &c. all which, he says, are at large answered in the Reply, where 'tis proved that either the allegations are false, or are no more to the Catholick Religion, than Judas his Treason is to Christianity. I have given him my word, that I will not meddle with his Reply, else I should tell him that 'tis something strange that Rebellions acted in pursuance of the most probable Doctors resolution of his Holiness his Bulls, and decisions of Councils, should be so wide from having to do with the Catholick Religion, unless happily what passes under that name be not Christianity. But he goes on and rails at the poor Albingenses and Piemonteses for being open Rebels. Good Sir remember a little, Were the Crusades employed against them for their Rebellion, or their Heresie, that is, dissenting from the Roman Doctrines? But if this do not do, I am to be confuted with the Quakers complaints against our persecuting of them. We are fallen into a good World when Papists write for Toleration, and make Apologies for Quakers. In fine, Our Author makes a grave remarque, that there is great difference between the Popish and Protestant Party, who as soon as we were in power, persecuted them their elder brother. I would very fain keep my word, and since I have promised it, say nothing to the

A Reasonable Defence

Walsley's Quid.
lib. p. 203.

Topick of our Authors *Reply*, the loyalty of his Party. But since he forces me to it, I must beg leave to remind him, that there was no great Persecution in *Edw. VI.* time, nor for the first 11. years of *Q. Eliz.* nay to the 23. of her Reign; and for that time I hope the Protestants were in power; yet the Papists had no cause to say that they were persecuted: and 'tis confess'd by their own Party, that their multiplied Treasons did extort all the severe Laws that were made against them. And whereas our Author wishes that the *Papists in England had half so much favour as the Piedmonteses have*; 'tis such an extremity of stupid ingratitude, as will certainly by no means recommend to the *favour and indulgence* which is begged for in the next period. If the *English Papists*, who live on their Estates in all freedom, affluence, and plenty, and as our Author acknowledges it, *have as much money in their purses as their neighbors*, do yet complain of persecution, and wish to be in the state of the *Piedmonteses*, who live in that desolate poverty, that nothing but the luxury of cruelty could tempt men to take the pains to destroy them; we must not hope they will be ever satisfied with all the kindness we can shew them. But to satisfy all doubts, my Adversary, as if he came *Legate à latere* to reconcile the Nation to the Church of *Rome*, gives us unquestionable security, even his own fair word, which we have seen to be frail enough; telling us *that he declares upon the faith of a Christian, that he abominates for his own part, the very thought of blood and persecution; and that he verily believes the Catholics of England would not touch the least hair of any Protestants head (were they in power) for their Conscience.* I will be so charitable as to admit our Author may abominate or believe what he protests he does; but we cannot but know that he has a faculty of

of changing his belief ; and he cannot tell what an alteration a new face of things might make in his mind. In the mean time I am sure we have no reason to hope that all the Catholicks of *England*, however transformed of late from what they always were before, as our Author would perswade us they are, are a distinct species of Christians from those elsewhere ; particularly of *Ireland*, for whom our Undertaker is so cautious as not to engage. So that we must resolve that *St. Patricks* benediction is transferred to us, and the most poisonous Jesuited Viper of *Ireland*, that eats his way through his Mothers bowels, (for I say our Author has nothing to plead for them) so soon as set upon the *English* Shore, loses all his venoms, and is as harmless as Innocence it self.

We might have ended here, but that our Author is to shew one piece more of my matchless impudence, which is, that *Del Rio* informs us that the Powder Plot was with the privacy and direction of the Pope ; when as this Author published his Book in Feb. 1598. (for then the License for printing it, bears date) which is seven years before that treasonable machination ; nor hath he a word there of *England* in the place : and where-as I say that *Clement VIII.* gave order that no Priest should discover any thing that came to his knowledge by Confession, for the benefit of the secular Government, 'tis absolutely false ; for his Holiness his Precept was only to the Superiors of the Regulars (as the said Author expressly tells us) that they should diligently beware of making any thing known, discovered by Confession, to advantage their own exterior Government ; that is, if by Confession a Superiour came to know the natural imperfections of a Subject, as his lying, idleness, or prodigality, &c. he should not therefore put him out of his Office, &c. The Gentleman has now done, but let us see where is this matchless impudence that I am charged with ? Is

Cap. 5. p. 113.

Disqui. Mag.
L. c. c. R. § 1.

it because I say the Gunpowder Treason was with the Privy and direction of the Pope; surely that cannot be it, for that hath been asserted by others long before me; particularly by Bishop *Andrew* in his Book against *Bellarmin*. who says that his Holiness had ordered three 'Bulls to be in readiness on the other side the Water, 'which were to be sent over and published in several 'parts of the Nation so soon as the blow was given. Or possibly the fault is, that I say *Del Rio* informs me of it. If I can prove that an ordinary Jesuite knew of it, and that some years before, I hope 'twill be a little more than probable, it was not a secret which the Pope might not be trusted with, till it was done. Now whether *Del Rio* knew of it or no, let his own words determine. The case he puts is this, 'Whether 'if a Confederate discover in Confession, that he or 'some else have placed Gunpowder, or such like matter, under such or such a house, and unless it be removed the house will be blown up, the Prince destroyed, 'and as many as are in, or are going out of the City, 'will sustain great mischief, or run an extream hazard, 'the Priest ought to reveal it, which is determined in the negative. 'Tis true here is no mention of *England*, but our Author, I dare say, can give a very good reason why that particular is omitted: and I am sure there are all other circumstances exactly enough to ground somewhat more than a loose possibility. Now if the matter stick here, I can produce subsidiary proofs that other Priests in foreign parts did know of the design some time before it was to be executed. But thirdly, It may be my impudence lies in quoting *Del Rio* for this matter of the Gunpowder Treason, who wrote his Book seven years before that treasonable machination was to be put in execution: And this our Author has been very curious to

peruse. To this I might answer, that 'tis no news for *Romanists* to lay their Plots as deep as this; and a design, whose motions were to have violent fears as well as hopes, and which waited for the convening and Session of a Parliament, could not morally speaking, have a ready execution. But what if our Authors suggestion concerning the time of the publishing *Del Rio's* Books, notwithstanding *his very curious persuals*, be absolutely false, will he hereafter have the face to take himself to be a man of honour; or expect to be believed in any thing he writes or speaks? The truth of the Story in plain terms is this, The first edition of the two first Books of *Del Rio*, and only of them, came out in the end of the year 1599. the 7. of the Ides of *March*, for so *Del Rio's* Epistle to the Bishop of *Colen* assures us; who tells him 'That he puts forth a Specimen of his labour, and a kind of taste of the succeeding Feast, two of the six Books which he had written: and this he did because the approaching time of the *Maie*, and other delays hindred the publishing of more. Let my Author enquire for the *Lovain* Edition printed by *Gerard Rivius*, in the year 1599. and see if I falsifie. And this a man of any tolerable sagacity might have discerned in that very page which the Author cites; for there the *Lovain* Censors approbation of the first two Books stands and bears date, *Feb. 8. Ann. 1599.* Now does any body use to print the four last Books of any Work before the two first? So much then be said to the first part of our Authors *diligence*. I am now to shew when the four last Books of *Del Rio* came forth, and particularly the last Tome, in which our present concern is placed. And for this let the *Lovain* Edition by the same *Gerard Rivius* in the year 1600, and the Dedicatory

See Proceedings
against
the late Trai-
tors.

tory Epistle to the foresaid Elector of *Colen*, dated the fifth of the Calends of *March*, in the 16. secular year, be my evidence. This being laid down, let us now cast up our account, and reckon from the very end of the year, 1600. to the first year of K. *James* his Reign, *March* 1603. at which time the *Gunpowder* Traitors had actually confederated, and I would fain know if that interval make seven years. Our Author had much better have insisted on the Discourses of Father *Garnet* to the Conspirators; that he (good man) perswaded them to acquaint his Holiness before they proceeded; who accordingly dispatched Sir *Edmund Baynam* on that service. But they are strangers to the artifice of that Father, who would take this for an argument that the Pope was kept in ignorance till then. And besides, we are not concerned whether the Pope knew or approved of such a Plot 3 years, or 3 months before it was put in execution, so as it be certain that at the later term he did know of it. And therefore if these probabilities I offer from *Del Rio* should not be convincing to one that will be obstinate, there will be nothing gained to our Authors cause, so long as there is other evidence of his being privy to it.

But after all, my *matchless impudence* may perchance lie in the application of his Holiness's Bull to the secular Government, which the Author says is absolutely false. Be my Errour or my Impudence what it can be, I am sure it is not matchless, for I say nothing but upon the credit of *Del Rio*, who quotes this Bull of *Clement V* II. and answers this very Objection, which as if it were fire new. our Author is here pleased to urge with so much confidence and assuming. This Sanction 'says *Del Rio*, though it obliges only those to whom it 'was directed, yet it sufficiently shews that his Holiness

linefs approves that opinion, which will have Confessors behave themselves altogether so, as if they had heard nothing at all in Confession.

The Author having thus happily demonstrated my matchless impudence in this quotation of *Del Rio*, he comes next to shew my want of integrity, in the mention of the accusation of the Bishop of Angelopolis against the Jesuit: which I know has been answered to the full in the late Letters against Mr. Stillingfleets Idolatry. My Author is wonderful kind in making me know ever and anon things that I am a most perfect stranger to. I know indeed, that a confident asseverer has the face to say that the Bishop of Angelopolis Letter was forged at Port Royal by the Jansenists; but he should have told us farther, that the Bulls of Pope Innocent X. and the long decisions in the cause, which we have at large in *Cherubin's Bullarium*, were forged also. A man a little better versed in Books and things than our Author, would have understood that this groundless cavil was many years since suggested by *F. Annat* in France, and soon after, beyond reply or contradiction, refuted by the Curez of Paris. But every thing is new and demonstrative to one, who knows no better than our Author. His quarrel with Dr. Du Moulin for quoting Mr. Whites Book of Government, when not only that, but all the other works of that Catholick Leviathan, are condemned by the Pope, is owed to the same original, the not understanding what is talked of; for every body knows that Mr. White might have wrote what Treason he had pleased against Princes, and have fared no worse than his neighbours, if his *Tabula Suffragiales*, and some other of his Writings, had not been so unfortunate as to touch his Holiness his Copy-hold in the point of Infallibility, of his being Judge of Cantroversies of Faith and Pur-

Cherubin Tom.
:p. 186. ad
301.

Neufieme Es-
crite du Curez.
de Paris, p. 518

Tabu. Suffr. d
p. 101. ad 173.

gatory,

A Reasonable Defence

gatory, the very best part of the Papal Revenue: and thereby rendred heretical all that he had wrote or could write hereafter.

I am come now to the Postscript, which being nothing but a heavy repetition of what has been said before, requires very little answer. Therefore I shall only say, that if the members of the Church of *England* must not refuse or oppose treasonable principles and practises, without falling under the imputation of *Incendiaries, Persecutors, having ill natured seditious designs and the Churches being conscious of its weakness*; 'tis to be doubted there are really such designs on foot, as cannot well consist with having those doctrines and practises exposed to open view.

I have now done, and endeavoured to answer every thing but the contumely of my Author. Had I a mind to have requited his favour, and been his Godfather, as he was pleased to be mine, he must needs know I could easily enough, out of some of our *Englisb* Plays, have found a name which would have fitted him as well, and stuck as close as that he has bestowed on me; but when all is done, what is a Nick-name, the crying *Sir Pol, the urining at St. Mark, or the Tortoise*; to the merit of the cause between the Protestant and the Papist? I cannot think our Religion and Laws, our Liberties and Lives, are so trivial a Prize, as to be carried by a Mastery in fooling. When our Author shall think fit to write with the sobriety of one who treats of Religion, the civility of a Gentleman, and the veracity of a man of honour; he may look for a respectful and modest reply; otherwise from me he shall have no more trouble, for I am not at leisure to throw dirt, nor will I be a Buffoon for Company.

F I N I S.

THE
DIFFERENCE
BETWEEN THE
Church and Court
OF
ROME,
CONSIDERED:
IN SOME
REFLECTIONS
ON A
DIALOGUE
ENTITLED,

A Conference between two *Protestants* and a *Papist*.

The Second Edition Corrected and Augmented

By the Author of the Late *Seasonable Discourse*.

L O N D O N :

Printed by *Andrew Clark* for *Henry Brome*, at the Gun in *St. Paul's*
Church-yard, at the West-End, 1674.

68:03

THE
DIFFERENCE
BETWEEN THE
CHURCH and COURT
OF
ROME,
CONSIDERED.



Aving found my self concern'd to Vindicate the *Seasonable Discourse*, (which shew'd the Necessity of Maintaining the Establish'd Religion in Opposition to Popery) from the Passionate Cavils of the Full Answerer: I think it necessary further to advert to what is offered by

a more temperate and knowing Writer, in Bar to my Assertions; whether in direct contradiction to them, or incidentally in order to the framing an Apology for those moderate men of the Roman Communion, who disown the Exorbitances of the Pope, though they remain addicted to that Church.

Writers of this kind, who not onely ioyn with, but seemingly out-go us, in a just abhorrence of some of the odious parts of Popery, thereby gain an advantage to recommend both themselves and the other less scandalous, though equally pernicious, Doctrines of the Roman Church; and also to bring in that Whole Religion at the Postern-Door, which would never be admitted at the Gate.

And if this be the natural Effect of the Pretences made to Moderation, however specious they appear, I presume 'twill be esteem'd by sober men no ill Office to detect the fraud and

The Difference between the

danger of them; and demonstrate the Unpracticableness and utter Impossibility, of that Dream of Reconciliation with those our Adversaries; who cannot dismiss an Errour, but they must part with Infallibility to boot; nor incline to the Demands of Truth or Charity, without the forfeiture of Interest and Reputation: In a word, cannot acquit themselves of Treason, without renouncing an Article of their Faith.

Now our Author having thought fit to propose what he had to say in this *Affair*, in the form of a Dialogue; which though in it self a popular and perswasive method, is yet by reason of its frequent Transitions and Ornamental Appendages, not very proper for the carrying on an Argumentative Debate: I shall therefore consider the Heads of Discourse which I find insisted on by him, those I mean which seem material, distinctly and apart, and fairly given. y thoughts upon them.

Where my first Enquiry shall be.

I. *Whether peaceful Pretences are Baits to catch the unwary Proselyte, who when he is once hung, there is no getting loose again; but Concessions are retracted, the painted shew washed off, and he has nothing left but a fruitless repentance?* All which the Author peremptorily denies, pag. 8.

II. *Whether if the State would think fit to allow the English Papists, such, of whose Fidelity and Affection to their Country the Governours were well assured, to whom those Papists might have recourse for their spiritual Concerns, they would remove our jealousies of their being over-much affected to Strangers, &c.* Which is asserted pag. 6.

III. *Whether the Popes power in deposing Kings be a Doctrine of the Roman Church?* Which is denied, p. 9, 10, 11, 12.

IV. *Whether Princes of the Roman Communion have sufficient Powers to defend themselves from the Tyrannies and Encroachments of the Pope?* Which is said, p. 16, 17, 18.

V. *Whether Religion were the Cause of the Massacres in France and Ireland?* Which is denied, pag. 19.

These severals being honestly discuss'd, will I presume go very far toward the undeceiving of all those, who without the mixture of Prepossession and Interest, which no evidence can convince, are led aside by fair Appearances; and are so credulous

lous

Church and Court of ROME.

3

lous to think every thing possible, which some bold Undertaker has the Confidence to say is easie; and every thing practicable which some man of speculation demonstrates to be possible.

ENQUIRY I.

Whether Peaceful Pretences are Baits to catch the unwary Profelyte, who when he is once hung, there is no getting loose again, but Concessions are retratted, the painted shew wash'd off, and he has nothing left but a fruitless Repentance?

In which Enquiry concerning the insidious practising of the Romanists to draw men into Popery, It will be reasonable to observe the method used in this affair: Where I might very justly insit upon the down-right Cheats, Juglings, and Impositions practised by the Factors for Popery, notoriously evidenced not only by credible Testimony and flagrant Facts; but also by publick Acts of Court, and Judicial Records: Of which the Reader may have large accounts from Archbishop* *Harsnet*, Mr. *Gee*, Mr. *Baddiley*, *Pots*, & others. To which might be added the impudent Defences of pious Frauds, directing of Intention, and Apologies for that artificial way of lying called Equivocation; as also the fallacies & empty Paralogisms constantly used and solemnly recommended in the Affair of gaining Profelytes to the Roman Church.

As a Specimen whereof, to avoid trouble to the Reader and my self, I will mention those which are proposed by *Thomas à Jesu*, in his large work concerning the Conversion of all Nations, borrowed as he tells us, from *Coster*, *Possevino*, and other eminent Writers in that Cause. Where (a) he advises not to dispute with Hereticks, but rather express an intimate kindness for their souls; and first demand of them, *What they think of all their Ancestors?* Whether they imagine they were damn'd for being Papists? An Argument, which, had it any force, must persuade Jews Mahumetans, and Heathens, never to be Christians; and as it happens here in *England*, must oblige us never to be Papists, lest we should condemn our Fathers, Grandfathers, and Great Grandfathers, all those Ancestors for whom we have the most sensible Concern, who all were Protestants. The next Direction is, *To ask the Dissenter from the Church of Rome, Why he is of this Sect rather than that, why a Lutheran rather than*

* Declares of egregious Popish Impositions, &c. Foot out of the Snare. Examination of sowdres, &c. Boy of *Ussin* &c. chambers. Shet-n. (a) Tho à Jesu de convert. omn. gent. P. 561, &c.

Ibid.

The Difference between the

Ibid.

a Calvinist, &c. And if he says, Because he sees more reason to be of this Sect than of another, to conclude he is a Heretick, because he chooses one Religion before another. One would wonder that they who are perswading men to prefer Popery before Protestantism, should at the same instant declare it a Mark of Heretic to chuse a Profession in Religion: That they should pretend to give Reasons why men should be Papists, and yet hold it a pernicious thing to be of that Religion which they have Reason to be of. The third Demand is as convincing as the former, *To ask the Protestant where his Church was before Luther?* As if Religion were therefore new, because freed from Innovations: Not to question the Age of the Popes Universal Monarchy, Transubstantiation, Image-Worship, the Sacrilege of taking the Cup from the Laity, and one Commandment from the Decalogue, Encroachments which we all know when they came into the Church: 'twill be more than enough to ask where was the Roman New Creed, before the Council of *Trent*; which was invented many a fair year after that very Reformation which is accus'd of Novelty.

These are the goodly Machines which are recommended to batter down the protestant Cause, and which we see every day propos'd with such confidence as if they had really some force or value in them, and where these Stratagems succeed, lest the fraud and folly of them should be detected, great pains is taken to perswade the unhappy Profelyte immediately to discard all Heretical Books, especially the Bible; and the conversation of Hereticks, especially Divines. But because in this Noon-day Light of Christian Knowledge, the Generality of Protestants is not apt to be perswaded to quit their Faith on these slight terms; the next dexterity will be (which is the Head we are now immediately concern'd in) *to make them believe that they are much mistaken if they measure Popery from Prejudice and common Fame, or the Expressions of the School-men, or peevish Writers of Controversie: The Church speaks in the Canons of her Councils; and if they be soberly considered, 'twill appear there is not so vast a distance between both parties, as is vulgarly imagin'd: This is at large inculcated, as by our Countrymen, Sanila Clara, Hugh Cressy, Tilden, and others; so with great vogue and ostentation by the Bishop of Condom, in his celebrated*

celebrated *Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholick Church concerning matters in Controversie*; which he has transformed and molded to render it more soft and plausible several times (b) over: So that we are so far from learning of him the Doctrine of his Church, that we cannot discern what is his own; every Edition altering the Scheme and way of Proposal. I may not omit to add upon this Head the mention of my Author, who spends whole pages of his little Dialogue in shewing the (d) *Moderation of the Church of England* in difference to other Reformation; and the easiness by good handling to procure a Reconcilement. But all these Pacifick Men are so artificial as to conceal what ill Treatment the Authors of such Discourses have ever had, where they were in earnest, and there was no collusion in the case: For instance, *Erasmus, Cassander, Modreus, The Interimists, F. Barnes, &c.* And what is more material, the Bull of *Pius the IV.* who made the *Trent Creed*, and confirm'd the Dictates of that Assembly which forbids that any Person of whatsoever Order or Dignity in the Church, his Holiness only excepted, do explicate the Decrees of the Council in any manner, or upon any pretence; withal he nulls and makes void all such Explications. So that, be we Protestants never so much disposed to a composition; there is no Concession to be look'd for on the Papists part, who are not only accountable for the Heterodoxy of their Interpretations, but for the very offer at interpreting. And therefore how ever the Heretick may be born in hand before his Reconcilement to the Church of Rome, of great Indulgence to Dissenters in Speculative Points: so soon as he is made a Profelyte, the case is alter'd, and he must believe as the Church believes, or 'twere as good to believe nothing at all. I had thought here to have instanc'd in Mr. *Hugh Gressy's* Improvements in the Catholick Faith after his first Conversion; Whereby all his kind Remembrances of the Church of England, and offer of giving Security to the State, mentioned in the First Edition of his *Exomologesis*, are forgotten in the Second; with several other Remarkable Varieties, and Additional Periods and Sections in the place of those that were expung'd: with which, when the aforesaid Mr. *Gressy* was charged, as gross and scandalous falsifications; he had no better excuse to make, than by protesting solemnly,

(b) *Response au livre de Monsieur l'Eveque de Condom, en l'asserisement*
(d) P. 7, 8, &c.

Bull Pii IV.

(f)

The Difference between the

(f) Animad.
P. 76, 77, &c.

(f) That he knew nothing of the Alterations, they being put in by his Superiours, to whose discretions he had entirely left his Book, and it seems his own Honesty and Honour. But I find my self prevented in this particular by the late honourable Animadverter on that inconstant man; and therefore unto him I remit the Reader.

(g) Consult
P. 56.

George Cassander, who labours in the Affair of Reconciliation as much, and understood it as well, as any man; lays it down as a fundamental Maxime, That the (g) Church can never have the desired peace, unless they lead the way to it, who have given the cause to the distraction: that is, unless those who are in place of Ecclesiastical Government, will remit of their immoderate Rigour, and yield somewhat to the peace of the Church; and hearkning to the Admonitions of pious men, will set themselves to correct manifest Abuses according to the Rule of Divine Scripture, and of the Primitive Church from which they have swerved.

Now can any one be so fond to think that his Holiness will tamely strip himself of the *Regalia Petri*, and be reduced to the Neighbour-like Terms of the old *Regula Patrum*? Will he part with his Universal Monarchy, and be satisfied with a primacy of Order, his Suburbicarian Region, and a little Diocesis in a part of Italy? Will he leave off to have his feet upon the necks of Kings, and his hands in theirs and their subjects pockets, and be in earnest *servus servorum*? I need not ask whether the Cardinals will come off from their Pontifical Sloth and Luxury, and quitting their Pensions and Commendams; remember they were poor Parish Priests and Deacons? But will the meanest Father or Curé perswade himself to disown his power of making God, and disposing of him at his pleasure; in the language of *Pere Cotton*, loose the omnipotence of having his God in his hand, and Prince at his feet; and in pure self-denial quit the power of the Keyes in the gainful pretences of being able by the vertue of the Sacrament of Penance, and some grains of Attrition added to it, to remit all sins how horrid soever; and sneak into a Ministerial Stewardship of a *Clave non errante*? Or farther, shall the barters for Masses, (whose whole merit is said to be applied by the intention of the Priests, and the Lay-mans payment for them; though neither understand a word of the whole Office, and the later do

Church and Court of ROME.

7

do not so much as hear it read, and can have no concern therein, unless perchance his share in the idolatrous Worship of the elevated Wafer:) upon which work alone so many thousand lay Friars are constantly maintained, be laid aside for the reasonable service instituted by our Saviour, and the entire perception of the holy Eucharist, according to that his Institution of it?

I know men are apt to believe that which they vehemently wish; and very wise and sober men were induced to think heretofore a closure with the Church of Rome no impossible matter: but the case is quite altered since the time of the Council of Trent; which has establish'd every thing that ought to be remov'd; and shew'd the world how vain their hopes were from Synods, and universal Councils. How formidable the very approaches to Reformation were to those Fathers, abundantly appears from that History of *Padre Paolo*; and this is acknowledged abundantly by my (b) Author.

And now let us suppose an easy-going, good-natur'd man, (b) P. 13. by very fair words, or perchance visions or exorcisms, chous'd of his Religion: and at last awaken'd from the pleasant dream of being in the bosom of the *Roman Church*; discovering the guilt and folly of his vile Apostacy from that Holy Mother, in whose Faith he was Baptized; and also the fraud of those that had seduced him from her. Shall he start back and render himself abhorred unto that Party to which he was so lately reconciled; and suffer the reproaches of the other he so unworthily deserted? Will it not be easier for him to sit down with the contempt of *Levity* in one Instance, than to repeat the shameful Act; desert what he had chose, and chuse again what he deserted? Since he must be contemned and hated, will it not seem better to have some to own him, than none at all? What effect a perverse bathfulness has in other cases, we all know; it being proverbial, That 'tis a greater shame to bring home the Bridle than steal the Horse: and the Renegado *Turke* we find by common experience is so far from refusing the Profession of Christianity, that he is sure to be its mortal and inveterate Enemy: so that there needs little more security of having one continue in the Profession of Popery, than by any means to beguile him to ad-

The Difference between the

(i) P. 2.

mit it; a second Revolt being abundantly precluded by the first. But let us go on forward and examine, how honestly we are treated when we are made believe that there is a fair retreat afforded, for that the (i) *Papists have no prisons in which to keep men against their wills*, as our Author tells us. 'Tis very well they have no *Lollards Tower in England*, but we cannot but remember what has been heretofore. I am sure in those Countreys where the Inquisition is on foot, men may easily get into a Goal, upon the least surmise of an intention to quit the *Roman-Catholick Religion*. Nay, where that Tyranny takes no place, 'tis plain enough that Votaries are no at large to go when, or whither they have a phansie. What think we of the Monasteries and Nunneries in Popish Countries, whither young children are spirited away from their Friends, or barbarously exposed by them? Were the doors of those Houses left open, would it not soon appear by their providing for their Liberty on such an opportunity, that there was something of restraint that held them in? But by our Authors leave, is there nothing can confine a man besides a Prison? He that being taken by the Enemy in War, goes at large on his Parole to get himself exchanged; is, I humbly conceive, no less a Prisoner, than when under Guard, and in the Marshalls custody. And if the word of a Souldier, the bare engagement upon honour have this force, what shall we say to a solemn Oath, backed with direful execrations in case of faillance? Now that Profelytes to Popery are in this strict manner tyed not to desert it, I demonstrate from the *Roman Pontifical*, and the order of reconciling a Heretick to the Church; The words are these.

Pontif p. 94, 95 J. N. being convine'd of the snare of Division wherein I was held; after long deliberation, with ready and unconstrained will, the Divine Grace being my Guide, am returned to the unity of the Apostolick See. But lest I may be thought not to have returned with a pure mind, or with dissimulation: I engage under the penalty of falling from my Estate, and the obligation of an Anathema; and Promise to you N. Bishop, and by you to St. Peter Prince of the Apostles, and our most holy Father in Christ and Lord, our Lord N. the Pope and his Successors, that I by no persuasions of any persons, or by any other means will return to the Schism, from which I

Church and Court of R O M E.

am freed by the Grace of our Redeemer : but will alwayes remain in the Unity of the Catholick Church, and the Communion of the Pope of Rome. Wherefore I Swear by the Omnipotent God, and the holy Gospels, that I will stedfastly continue in the Unity and Communion aforesaid. And if (which God forbid) I should divide myself from this Unity upon any occasion or argument : incurring the guilt of Perjury, let me appear bound over to eternal Punishment: and have my Portion in the World to come with the Author of Schism. So help me God, &c.

What effect such Imprecations naturally have, 'tis obvious to apprehend. I my self know several persons, that having been perverted to Popery, were afterwards convinced of the Errors of it, and returned into the bosom of the Church of England : but then being hazen'd with the remembrance of those Curses they had laid on their heads, if at any time they should leave the Roman Communion, went, after some years continuance in our Church, back again to that of Rome. Which I the rather mention, because our Author is so very peremptory, that no such thing is done, and wages his reputation in the case.

ENQUIRY II.

Whether if the State would think fit to allow the English Papists, such, of whose Fidelity and Affection to their Country the Governments were well assured, to whom those Papists might have recourse for their spiritual Concerns, they would remove our jealousies of their being over-much affected to Strangers, &c.

It may here in the first place be well worth the enquiry, whether it be possible for Papists to give the State where they live such an assurance as is talkt of? For beside that, their Clergy, and all those in Religious Orders, have separate Interests from the State, and by their Calibate have given no Pledges to it : Certainly all they whose faith it is that Princes may be Excommunicated, and then deprived of their Dominions by the Pope, can by no imaginable way give security to the State for their Obedience to their Prince, and Fidelity to his Government : And it is not only altogether undeniable, that this is the Faith of most Romish Confessors, and

The Difference between the

Pilests, and Orders, but also that it is the Faith of the Church of Rome it self, I shall sufficiently prove in the following Section.

But secondly, They who hold that no Faith is to be kept with Hereticks, who teach equivocation, as laudible and innocent, who believe they can be dispenced with for any outward compliance with Dissenters in Religion by the Pope, do evidently by such Doctrines set themselves without the terms of humane Society, and are not to be trusted upon those Obligations, which other men of narrower Principles are bound by. How probable the former Doctrines are esteemed in the Church of Rome, we may learn from their celebrated Writers. As to the later, I mean his Holiness giving Commission to his Factors to dissemble their Profession, I have shewed at large in the seasonable Discourse, and justified my Allegation against the Exceptions of the full Answerer in my Reply to him. Though indeed the Compliance of, in a manner, all the Papists of England, and coming to our Church-Service for the first 11 years of Q. Elizabeth, would to true English-men, be a competent account of this matter. Especially since 'tis notoriously known, that not long after, in Scotland, there were intercepted the very Dispensations from Rome, whereby generally the Roman-Catholicks were permitted to promise, swear, subscribe, and do what else should be required of them, so as in mind they continued firm, and did use their diligence to advance in secret the Roman Faith. Which being shewed to the King, were the cause of some Severities, as the judicious Spotswood observes, which were then in that Kingdom used against the Papists.

I might add to this the Oath of Subjection and Obedience to the Pope, to keep and defend his Regalities, and not discover his Secrets, which every Popish Bishop takes at his Consecration, set down at large by my Author himself, and which he pretends he would not take for the best Bishoprick in Christendom. Now this Oath being part of the Office for a Bishops Consecration in the Roman Pontifical, must be presumed (however my Author would dissemble it) to be taken by every Prelate of that Church: And if so, I demand what security one so obliged can give to any State? If he bind him-
self

Arch. Spotswood History
p. 308.

Pontificale
Rom.

self by an Oath of Allegiance, that will come too late, and the former Engagement must take place against the latter. Besides, he who shall be so profligate to take a second Oath contrary to a first, gives no security thereby; it justly having no more esteem with other men, than it had with the unhappy Swearer himself. As also, I demand whether any person so obliged can reasonably be thought, in the Examination previous to the conferring of Orders, to have passed over this fundamental Point on which the *Roman* Hierarchy depends, or to be willing to confer Orders on those who are *Heterodox* therein? Withal, whether the Bull of *Pius IV.* subscribed, and the Oath of Canonical Obedience taken, perpetually by every Priest of the *Roman* Church, do not involve them in the strict Obligations before recited, and the Consequences appendant to them?

'Tis true, our Author talks very freely of the disorders of the Papacy, and pretends that those of his way are excommunicate. For all this, it may not be safe to trust them without better assurance. We remember from sad Experience, that no persons did so boldly rail at the Tyrant *Cromwel.* as those that were his Pensioners, who merited by saying those very things which others were to lose their Lives or their Estates barely for hearing. Nay, we have not forgot, that some of these perfidious Wretches lay under the common calamity of honest men, Sequesterings, Restraints, and Decimations, that they might continue unsuspected Villains. And we are not sure but his Holiness may be as dextrous in his Managery as that Tyrant was; making a shew of great Displeasure against those Agents of his which are hired to pretend a disagreement with the Court of *Rome*, and sufferings by it, thereby to gain securely Profelytes to the Church, and a Reward unto themselves.

Nor will this be esteem'd an uncharitable Surmise, when we consider what usually is done by this sort of men, upon like pretensions. I shall, to avoid giving trouble to the Reader, bring but one single instance; yet it shall be so close and commensurate a Parallel in all respects, as not to admit of any colourable Exception to it. 'Tis that of *F. Watson* the Secular Priest, who having wrote at large in the defence of Sovereign Princes, against the Dictates of the Jesuite, where-

Watson's
Quodlibets,
Dialogue be-
tween a Secu-
lar Priest and
Lay Gentle-
man.

in ..

The Difference between the

A true Relation of the faction begun at Wirbich.

Quod.
P. 37, -
69,
88,
89,
201,
266, &c.
275, &c.
303, &c.

* Discourse of the powder Treason, Apology for the Oath of Allegiance. Premonition to all free Princes and States. Answers to Cardinal Peronand Bellarmine, &c.

in he openly confesses, *That all the sufferings brought upon the Papists here in England, was the due Reward of their own Demerits*: And withal detected the Frauds and Villanies of the Jesuites, not only in reference to the State, but their Cheats of private persons by means of Auricular Confession, and other gainful Methods of Hypocrisie, setting down the Names of the persons wrought upon, and theirs who practised upon their easiness, with the particular sums thus gained, the place, and time, and manner of the Action; proofs one would think of the greatest sincerity imaginable; especially since he for this was with all possible violence pursued and railed at by his Adversaries in the Church of *Rome*, and seemingly persecuted by his Holiness, and Arch-Priests commissioned by him: Yet after all, we find this man at last was discovered to be engag'd in Treason against his Sovereign, and plotting all those Villanies he had before so solemnly declaimed and wrote against: the account whereof we have in all our Histories.

Hitherto we have seen how the overture of admitting and tolerating such Priests as will profess the plausible Opinion of the power of Princes above the Popes, is Unreasonable, upon the General Head of Security to be given by them. Let us now consider how far it is Practicable under a Protestant Prince, who cannot make Popish Bishops nor Priests; and such as are already made by the Pope or his Authority, if they profess these Tenets, (if we could be sure they did hold them) will, as is confess'd, not only be disabled to officiate, but also be sent for away, and others of another sort sent in their place; and I believe they think they are oblig'd to so much Obedience to the Pope, as to remove upon his Call, at least while they have no Churches proper to them.

The truth is, all correspondence between the Crown and the Papists is matter of so much Jealousie, that I cannot see any possible advantage that can recompence it. The little intercourse which was in king *James* his time, (notwithstanding his Writings *against the Pope and his Usurpations, his frequent Speeches in Parliament, and that strange Solemnity of Attestation, the apprecating Destruction to those of his Family in succeeding Generations, who should attempt a departure to Popery, and dereliction of the Religion profess in the Church

Church and Court of R O M E.

23

Church of *England*: Which remarkable passage is recorded by Judge *Crook* in his || Reports: I say notwithstanding all this done here in *England* to assure his Subjects, besides all that had past in *Scotland*;) the Umbrage then given by the Relaxations afforded at that Treaty with the *Spaniard*, was never recover'd in the minds of the people; but those Jealousies continued had the greatest share in those dismal Effects we have seen in our days: And I heartily wish we never see more; It is matter of my Fear, as well as of my Hopes and Wishes. This one consideration is enough to me to overthrow all those plausible projects which some have had of dividing the Papists, &c. We shall reap much prejudice, but never advantage by these attempts. Under shelter so obtain'd Converts will be made; who must afterward believe as the Church believes; which the shifting of a Confessor turns quite about; and there will always be found difference enough in opinion amongst their Doctors, to make Rebellion a probable Opinion, and Massacres too, when the season is fit for it.

† Sir George
Crook's Re-
ports, part. 2.
Term Trin.
A. 2. Fas. R.
in Banco
Regis.

Great Ostentation is made of the Loyalty of *Romanists*, from the frequent repetition of the Statutes against Provisors in the time of our Ancestors; and applied as a competent Security against those Usurpations of the Pope, which were said by the seasonable Discourse to tend so much to the impoverishing of this Nation. But in the mean time the Author doth not consider, that the frequency of those Statutes sheweth as much their insufficiency, as the making them argues the good will of the Legislators. Nor is it probable that any Remedy can be sufficient, when the Supremacy of the Pope is acknowledged, and where the whole belief of the Professors is concluded in that one rule of believing as the Church believes. For the Pope being supposed to be the Head of the Church, what Interpreters of the Church's Faith can they meet with equal to the Head of it? Not to speak of those who believe in the infallibility lodged in the Pope; General Councils are not every day assembled, nor is it probable the Pope will permit them, if likely to contradict or lessen his Authority. In their absence, what is there which can be put in ballance with the Reverence given to *St. Peter's* Chair, amongst the Professors of that Religion? Shall the opinion of one or two Priests stand

in

The Difference between the

in competition with the Pope? Can any man believe this plausible Doctrine of the power of Kings, and contempt of the Pope's in comparison of theirs, can have any other aim or effect than to procure a connivance or admittance of that Religion; which (whatever the opinion of some few Protestants may be, and what their sincerity is, may be another question) when it recovers its strength, must turn like the Countryman's snake, to sting those who with so much charity and kindness shall cherish and favour it.

To make this whole matter obvious to a common understanding; let us suppose some loyal person stumbling at the irregular claims of the Pope, and confusion and miseries brought into the world by that exorbitance; and upon the conviction of that one Point, which for its plainness he best understands, and for its influence and effect upon his secular Interests, he most studiously minds, holding fast the loyal Principles of the Church of *England*; since no other batteries can shake him, comes Father N. and tells him he is in a great mistake to think that the great exaltation of the Pope's Authority is so necessary a Doctrine; that for his own part he doth not believe it: Well, that stumbling-block being removed, there is a Convert made to the *Romish* Church, perhaps eminent enough to lead many others by his Example; at least it is highly probable he wants not influence upon his Wife and Children, if not others of his Relations and Acquaintance, to pervert them also, probably without conditioning so severely for their loyalty. But what will become even of that capitulation, when after (perhaps some years of confirmation in all the *Romish* Opinions, and particularly that of submission to the Churches Authority) death or the censure of the Pope may have removed, or a preferment have converted F. N. or such loyal Casuist: For why may he not change his Opinion as Father *Cressy* did his in that very particular, who in the first Edition of his *Exomologesis* made a Protestation of his Duty and Obedience, which is corrected in the second? And in any of these cases our Proselyte shall find himself entangled with the new Doctrines of his confessor, who in a season when Factions of State or other Circumstances prepare men for such dangerous Doctrine.] (as they are too subtle to avow them, or at least
prefis

press them unreasonably) shall urge the submission to the Churches opinion; and then the quotations of so many Doctors (which are now by our Author rejected and slighted in comparison of one or two plausible opinions) shall sound loud in concurrence with the Head of the Church, who besides the credit of his own determination, has the prescription of so many Ages, the actual deposition of Princes in all parts of Europe from time to time, and the decrees of Universal Councils, to justify his claim. In vain shall the Penitent alledge to his Confessor, that Father N. was of that opinion: The Reply will be easie, that Father N. was a good, yea and a learned man in things where he agrees with the Church; but still he was a man, and subject to error, and therefore not to be credited when he disagreed with the Church; of which the Pope, Colledg. of Cardinals, General Councils, and so many Doctors who have wrote before and after Father N. are better and more credible Expositors than he. It will be hard for any body to disentangle himself from this Argument, if he have once surrendered his Faith implicitly to that of the *Roman Church*, or as we have shew'd, under the usual Obligations been engaged in its Communion. And if a person of so remarkable loyalty, as we in this Instance suppose our Profelyte to be, cannot be able to withstand and secure himself; what shall we suppose of those his Relations and Acquaintance, whom his Authority and Example turned to the Church of *Rome*, perhaps with less Circumspection?

I have many reasons to believe F. N. to be a very honest man; as I know him to be ingenuous and learned: and therefore stand amaz'd to see him offer to the World a Proposal so unreasonable as this is. If he be in earnest as I must suppose him to be, his Address to one of our Church, whom he would bring over to his Part, will run in this or such like Form.

Those only belong to the Fold of Christ, who are under the conduct of the Universal Pastor, his Holiness the Pope; and they alone are sound in the Faith, and consequently capable of Salvation; who believe the Doctrine received by the Catholick, that is, the *Roman Church*; It is therefore necessary for you, as you tender the eternal welfare of your Soul,

C

religiously

The Difference between the

A Controversial Letter

religiously to obey this Pastor, and believe all the Proposals of this Church. But notwithstanding, though this Pastor and (as I shall presently demonstrate) this Church have solemnly declared that Princes may be excommunicated, and then deprived of their Dominions by his Holiness, you must by no means believe that damnable Doctrine; and though you are sure to be excommunicated for your stubbornness therein (as *F. N.* at this day is for this only crime) you must endure it, rather than comply with those false and rebellious Tenets, that subvert the Laws, destroy the Peace, and endanger the Sacred Persons of Sovereign Princes. In short, upon pain of damnation you must be in Communion with the *Roman* Church; and yet under the same penalty you must be content to be excommunicated; you must believe as the Church believes, and yet you must not believe so.

Before I leave this Point, I must beg leave to add one Observation, which may be useful to the determining, how far it will consist with Prudence to hearken to the Proposition made for the encouraging, by the relaxation of Penalties, those who are in the Communion of the *Roman* Church: It is plainly this, They are a sort of men who are always the worse for Favour and Indulgence. I mentioned but now the case of *F. Watson*, who after his many publick declarations of himself against the traitorous Jesuits, confuted all his Writings by his Actions.

But the particular which I now refer to, is the time of this his Enterprize; which was the entrance of *K. James* into this Kingdom; when all the severities of the Laws against the *Romanists* were laid asleep, and they received not only to a peaceful enjoyment of their Consciences and Estates, but were admitted to the Court, to Trust, to Honours and Preferments. Nor was this treachery and falseness his singular Demerit. At the same time, and under the same circumstances was the Agency of the *Romish* Factors with the King of *Spain*, for the procuring a second Invasion of their Native Country, which might expiate that of *88.* as also that hellish Machination of the Gun powder-Treason. These, though so barbarous in the intendment, as to be capable of no aggravation; had (besides the forementioned Ingratitude, of being

King James
his Discourse
of the Powder
Treason.

at-

attempted in a season of Indulgence;) this particular brand upon them, that they were deligned by those very men who had been guilty of Treasons in the time of *Q. Elizabeth*, and had been graciously forgiven by *K. James*, and personally had sued out their pardons from him under Seal. So that we may conclude it as reasonable an attempt to still a Tempest by whispering gently to it, put out a Fire by pouring Oyl upon it, or reclaim a Viper by receiving him into the Bosom; as to hope by any Acts of Kindness and Indulgence to assure the Duty of a Roman Votary, of whatever Principle or Subdivision he pretend to be.

Proceedings
against the
Gun-powder
Traitors.

ENQUIRY III.

Whether the Popes Power in deposing Kings be a Doctrine of the Roman Church?

Having debated this point already in the *Seasonable Discourse*, and defended what I there asserted in my Reply to the Full Answerer, there is really no need I should trouble my self or Reader in the proof of a thing perfectly evident. But since the Gentleman with whom I had first to do, and our present Author after him, think they have abundantly cleared themselves, by quoting a few Romanists who have denied the Exorbitant Tyrannies of the Pope, and separating the Interests of the Court and Church of Rome; with this Difference, that whereas the Full Answerer quite slips over the mention of Councils, this my Author after a short Reflection lightly passes the Allegations which I made from the Canons of the said Councils, which I pretend to have been receiv'd as Universal, not only by the high-flown Papalins, but these moderate pretenders; (and consequently what is by those Councils decreed, must beyond all subterfuge be concluded to be the Doctrine of the Church.) And whereas the said Author only adds some few colourable pretences to elude the Arguments drawn from the aforesaid Councils; I shall (which I take to be the alone remaining possible way of inforcement) set down the express words of those Councils in plain English; And then I hope there will need no infallible Interpreter to inform us of the meaning and importance of them. And having

The Difference between the

done this, I shall reply to those thin Sophisms which are brought to elude my Argument.

3 Concil. Lateran. Tom. conc. 17.

In the *Seasonable Discourse* I first cited the 27 Canon of the Third *Lateran Council*, *Cap. Sicut ait*: Where the Fathers having condemned the *Cathari*, &c. and subjected the Fautors of them to the same punishment with them, 'tis added, They shall forfeit all the Fealty, Homage, and Obedience which was due to them. Now we know who they are to whom Fealty and Homage, in its remarkable and most proper importance, is due. But to avoid all Cavil, this is determined to extend to Sovereign Princes by the express words of the Council of *Constance*, as we shall see anon. And therefore in the next place I proceed to the Fourth, and as it is styled by the Romanists,

4 Concil. Lateran. Tom. concil. 18.

the most General Council of *Lateran*: Where the Fathers having condemned all Hereticks that exalt themselves against the Catholick Faith by them explained; an Article whereof is, That in the Sacrament of the Altar the Body and Blood of Christ are really contained, the Bread being transubstantiated into the Body of Christ, and the Wine into his Blood; that is, (to wave all the monstrous Absurdities of Transubstantiation) that they who receive only the Bread, receive only the Body; and they who receive the Cup, only receive the Blood of our Saviour, (for concomitancy cannot suit with things entirely separate.) And having required the aid of the Secular Powers against the said Hereticks, the Council proceeds in this form: *If the Temporal Lord, requir'd or admonish'd by the Church, shall neglect to purge his Territory from Heretical pravity, let him be excommunicated by the Metropolitan and his Suffragans; and if he persist in neglecting to give satisfaction for the space of a year, let him be signified to the Pope, that he from thenceforth may pronounce his Subjects discharg'd from their Obedience, and expose his Territory to be seiz'd by Catholics; who having exterminated the Hereticks, without contradiction shall possess it and preserve it in the Purity of Faith: So as no injury be done to the Right of the Superiour Lord, where there is such; provided he do not any way oppose himself: and the same Law is to take place on them who have no superiour Lord.* Where we may observe how pitiful the Excuse is, which is commonly brought, that Sovereign Princes are not here meant, but only Feudatary; when, as if it were on purpose

to exclude this plea, those who are most Absolute and Supreme, are particularly level'd with the other. In the mean time, we of this Nation may take notice, That besides our own Runagates, (whom I cited in the *Seasonable Discourse*) who make our Kingdom to be held in fee from the Pope; in a manner all Foreign Writers go away with it as a thing confess'd and evident; and bring, as the common instance of the Popes power to depose Kings, that his Holiness may dispose of the Crown of *England*, even where they exempt the King of *France* from such subjection. But this upon the by. The same Council goes on, and says, That the Excommunicate Factors of Heresies shall have no Votes in Councils or Elections, shall not be allowed to make a Will, to give Testimony, or bear any Office, or inherit an Estate. If any happen to be a Judge, his Sentence shall be null and void: If an Advocate, he shall not be admitted to plead; if a Clerk or Notary, the Instruments drawn by him shall be of no moment: And so in all other like cases. Whence we may gather what assurance we are likely to have of the possession of our Estates, if Popery prevail. All Acts of Law, all Bequests of Wills, and Judiciary Proceedings since the Reformation, (and I suppose most English men hold under some of them) are absolutely void and null by the Decree of this Council; and we must come to new Purchases to be secur'd in the possession of whatsoever we possess, or challenge for our own. And how fair Chapmen we shall meet with in that case, it will not be difficult to determine.

My next Allegation is of the Council of *Lyons*, where the Pope after mature deliberation had with his Cardinals and the Council, having depos'd and deprived the Emperour; and absolv'd all those from their Oaths of Allegiance, who had sworn it to him; and commanded that no person should own him from thenceforth as Emperour, or any way obey or intend to obey him; and excommunicated all such as should give him Counsel, or any way favour him; and ordered that the Electors should proceed to a new Choice; the aforesaid particulars being read in the Council, the Pope and Prelates sitting in Council, with Candles burning in their hands, thunder'd out their Excommunication against the deposed Emperour Frederick, &c. The words of the Council are plain enough, but when illustrated

Tom. Conc.
18.

The Difference between the

strated by such a Comment as the actual Deposing of an Emperour, I cannot think it needful to subjoyn any farther Enforcement; but proceed to the remaining Allegation from the Determination of the Council of Constance: which in the seventeenth Session *decrees, defines, and ordains; that whosoever, whether he be King, Cardinal, Patriarch, Archbishop, Bishop, Duke, Prince, Earl, Marquess, or of any other Condition or Dignity, either Ecclesiastical or Secular, shall hinder, disturb, or molest Sigismund King of the Romans and Hungary, and the King of Arragon, from meeting, &c. shall incur the Sentence of Excommunication, &c. and shall be deprived of all Honour, Dignity and Office, &c.* Where, by the way, we may take notice, that this Council, who lay so severe Penalties on the Violators of their safe conduct, were not asham'd perfidiously to violate it themselves on *John Huss*, who in confidence thereof put himself into their hands.

Besides this, we alledg from this Council Pope *Martins* Letter, approved by the last Session of the same Council, where *his Holiness admonishes and requires all Professors of the Christian and Catholick Faith, the Emperour, Kings, Dukes, Princes, Marquesses, Earls, Barons, &c. that they drive out of their Kingdoms, Provinces, Cities, &c. all Hereticks, according to the tenour of the Lateran Council, which begins, Sicut ait, &c. And then decrees, That all Hereticks, Partakers or Defenders of them, though they shine in the Dignity of Patriarchs, Archbishops, Bishops, Kings, Queens, Dukes, or any other Ecclesiastical or Mundane Title, &c. shall be pronounced Excommunicate in the presence of the People, every Sunday and Holy-day, &c. and requires that they proceed to deprivation of Dignities, &c.*

Now our Author to all this given in proof by me from these oecumenical Councils, as the *Romanists* stile them, opposes the Authority of one *John Bishop*, who in a Book written in the time of *Q. Elizab.* proved that the Constitution of the *Lateran Council*, upon which the whole Authority of absolving Subjects from their Allegiance and deposing Princes is founded, is no other than a Decree of Pope Innocent the III. and was never admitted in England: yea, that the said Council was no Council at all, nor was anything at all there decree'd by the Fathers.

So then we are come to a Resolution of Faith. If one single
man

man shall write a Book against a received Doctrine in the Church, that founds it self on the Decree of a Universal Council; and shall deny that Council to be valid, or received in a particular Church; that Doctrine however received or founded, as is above mentioned, ceases to be the Doctrine of the Church: Which, if it be true, I believe 'twil be almost impossible for any man to be a Heretick; some one or other having wrote a Book in the defence of his Tenet, how Heterodox soever it were, and disparaged the Authority of that Council that condemned it. But this Author, who relies so much on the credit of *John Bishop*, should have adverted to those very cogent arguments which *Cardinal Perron* produces in his long Speech to the third Estate, and *Dr. Vane* has since brought in favour of that Council, and his Confutation of all Suggestions alledged on the contrary part. Also he should have taken notice of the Subsidiary proof lately added by *F. Labbe*, and *Cassart*, Editors of the Councils now at *Paris*, who there from a Copy supposed to be written in that very Age, give the Canons of that Council in *Greek*, deficient chiefly in those parts, where the Controversie between the Eastern and Western Church was determined to the disadvantage of the *Greeks*. And lastly, he should have considered that the Council of *Trent*, whose Authority he will not dispute, has alledged the Canons of this fourth *Lateran* Council, and therefore it will not be very reasonable to oppose *J. Bishop* to all those Fathers.

Harangue au tiers Etat p. 612. &c.
Dr. Vane Vindicat. of the Council of Lateran.

Tom. 11. part. 1.

Conc. Tril. Sess. 14. can. 8.

But to pass this: How comes it about that our Author tells us, this Council was never admitted in *England*? Did he consider what power the Pope then claimed in this Island; when he had rendred, and openly stiled the King his Vassal? As also how much work the *English* had to do in that Assembly, particularly in the case of *Stephen Langton*, then Archbishop of *Canterbury*; and that the Canons of that Council were allowed and confirmed in the National Synod held at *Oxford, A. 1222*. Had he told us that this convention, notwithstanding all its pompous pretences of so many Patriarchs, Emperours, Kings and Princes, Bishops and Doctors that attended at it, was nothing but a Scene dressed up in Masquerade; he would perchance have said something to the

Mat. Paris in Ann. 1222.

Binn's Council.

Tom. 7.

Part. 2.

pur-

The Difference between the

purpose: For instance, That the man who play'd the *Greek* Emperour was *Hen.* Brother to *Baldwin* Earl of *Flanders*, that had lately before seized *Constantinople* and some few more of the *Greeks Towns*, with the Arms of the *Croisade*; and had no other Title to his Conquests, besides the Popes gift: That the *Latin* Emperour, who yet was but Elect, was the Popes Pupil, so made by the will of his Mother *Constance*; and chosen Emperour by the Popes influence, who had unmade two Emperours before, of whom one, *i.e. Otto. 4.* was then living; and the next Pope save one, *Innocent* the IV. deposed this very Emperour: Farther, that *John de Brenne* and *Almeric* held the Kingdoms of *Jerusalem* and *Cyprus* of the Popes gift: That our King *John* was become his Feudatary, and as his Holiness was pleased to stile him, his *Vassal*; that *James* King of *Arragon* held by the same Copy, who besides was a Minor and Pupil to the Pope, who was so favourable as to give him a Crown, whose Father had deserved so ill as to forfeit to his Holiness both Kingdom and Life. Then farther, that *Philip* King of *France* had his Kingdom twice put under Interdict by this very Pope, and was threatned worse: That *Andrew* of *Hungary* was also by this very Pope threatned with Deprivation, and having thereby learnt Obedience, became his Creature and Favorite; and was made by him General of the *Croisade* against the *Mahometans*; as *Simon de Montfort* was of that against the Hereticks of *France*; and the Princes of *Flanders*, of that against the *Greek* Scismatics. This, one would think, were a fair account of all the Crown'd Heads that sent their Embassadors and Bishops to this Council. But the Ecclesiastical part of the Comedy was of the same piece; for of the four Eastern Patriarchs, as they call them, three were *Italians*, and one a *French-man*; all made by this Pope, and no more own'd by the people of those Churches to which they pretended, than his Holinesses titular Bishops use to be.

Our business here is not to consider, whether this or other Councils were free or obnoxious, since they be received by the succeeding *Roman* Church, and by our Author himself.

I would leave this Point, but that our Author is pleased to assert a very strange Paradox; that though I cited the third *Lateran* Council, that of *Lyons*, and that of *Constance*, besides this

this fourth of *Lateran*; yet on this fourth the whole Authority of absolving Subjects from their Allegiance, and deposing Princes is founded. Not to dispute the Superstructures of the two after Councils; certainly the third of *Lateran* could not well build upon the fourth, which was not then in being. I am sure the Council of *Constance* was so far from owning the having learnt this lesson from the fourth *Lateran* Council, that they expressly quote the third for the most Orthodox Doctrine of Treason and Rebellion. Where, by the way I cannot omit to mention the wonderful dexterity and confidence of Cardinal *Perron*, in his Oration to the third Estate; who in this matter produces the Decrees of this Council as a sufficient security for Princes: as also of the Penman of the Controversial Letters, who seems no stranger to our Author, and desires us to look upon the Church of Rome in a Council, to be convinc'd that she does not favour this deposing Power; And also singles out this very Council, to shew the Orthodox Doctrine of the most loyal *Roman-Catholic* Church, whose Decree I even now cited on the contrary part. When, as the Writer of the Controversial Letters plainly confesses, the Story is no more than this: There had prevailed an Opinion in this age, and it was seconded by Practice, that the People might at their pleasure correct their offending Lords, and kill Tyrants, notwithstanding any Oath made to them, without expecting the Sentence or Command of any Judge whatsoever. And this with much ado was condemned in this Council; thou it cost *John Gerson* a great deal of pains, and more than that, the imminent hazard of his Life, to compass thus much; That it should not be lawful for any ordinary Cut-throat to destroy Sovereign Princes; but remain the singular Prerogative of his Holiness the Pope.

I shall not exaggerate Consequences, nor pursue this Topic, which my Author complains never fails when any one has a mind to declaim against Papists, but hope, that notwithstanding his Profession, that he is yet to learn the name and situation of that Country which believes it; 'tis manifest as Noon-day-light, that whosoever believes the Article of the *Roman-Catholic* Church, must also, as large a morsel as it is, be content to digest, at least swallow this.

*Hiranguie an
telle Eflat.*

First Con-
trov. Letter.

The life of
Gerson prefix
to his works.
And Tom. 1.
p. 371. & 3.
p. 62.

P. 9.

The Difference between the

ENQUIRY IV.

Whether Princes of the Roman Communion have sufficient Powers to defend themselves from the Tyrannies and Encroachments of the Pope?

We have seen the Doctrine of the Church of Rome, concerning the Popes Power over Princes; which if it be truly stated, (and I think nothing in the world is evident if my Argumentation be not) will easily determine the issue of this Enquiry. For (not to insist on the many defects both intellectual and moral, which are pretended to incapacitate for Government, or otherwise forfeit it, discoursed at large by the Canonists, and more largely commented on by practise, in the deposition and removal of such Princes by Popes;) If we suppose them in all Points qualified for Rule, and zealous Assertors of the *Roman Faith*; yet notwithstanding upon any disobedience to the Churches Dictates, or contumacy of any kind to her Commands, which may subject them to the censure of the Church, and the displeasure of his Holiness, and thereby expose to Excommunication, (of the due infliction whereof they are only Judges,) all Right and Authority upon the Principles before laid down, immediately becomes forfeit: and the very questioning hereof in *Thesis*, the thing being determined by Oecumenical Councils, and so made *de Fide*, will be Heresie.

And now, whereas no Prince can maintain himself without the Obedience of his Subjects, and ready Execution of his Ministers; I demand whether upon any difference started (and unless the Prince will tamely give up all, there must be many) a Minister of State will dare to uphold and defend the Rights of his Master, in opposition to the Pope? If he do, he is sure to bring all the hatred of the Pope and Clergy upon him; and it is observed, that Ministers of State have seldom weathered the opposition of the Gown-men of either sort.

But what if we should say, that Princes themselves dare seldom adventure to maintain their own Rights against the Pope? Not to insist upon the personal apprehensions they may

may juſtly have of a Dagger from a *Clement* or a *Ravillae*: It is not unknown to any, that Princes, even when in Peace, live with the jealousies and precautions of War; and are as industrious for acceſſion of Allies and advantages to themſelves, as to prevent thoſe of a contrary party; ſtill expecting and providing for a ſtorm in the deepeſt calin of tranquility and peace. If (as ſometime heretofore they did) all *Europe* ſubmitted to the Pope, what advantage or diſadvantage to any Prince would the good will of the Pope be? What influence would he not have (by the Clergy) amongſt the people of any Prince, if not abſolutely to raiſe Rebellion, at leaſt, to ſlacken and abate the zeal and fervour of the people? What diverſions to this or that holy War, or Interpoſitions for Peace, could he not make, as it ſhould ſuit beſt with the party he ſhall moſt favour? And how hardly could ſuch plausible deſires be denied to the holy Father? Theſe and the like conſiderations render the Kings of *France* and *Spain*, ſo jealous of the making Popes or Cardinals: though it is certain the Popes dare not be ſo openly partial and unequal to Princes, (nor would that partiality be ſo fatal to their Interests) now as heretofore; becauſe the Reformation hath ſpread into many Countries, which value not the Inclination of the Pope; but rather incline to the party he moſt oppoſes. Which as it ſeems a counter-balance, ſo is it a great awe to the Pope; leſt their partiality ſhould force Princes to cheriſh and favour the Proteſtant party, and perhaps even to throw off his yolk. But if ever the Church of *Rome* could eradicate the Reformed Religion (which doubtleſs is and ever muſt be their great drift and aim) Princes of the *Romiſh* Religion would find the want of that check and awe upon the Pope.

Will you ſee how tender and fearful Princes have been heretofore of claiming their Rights in this kind? See *Ed. 3.* a brave and magnanimous Prince, in the vigour of his Age, in the 25 year of his Reign; when he comes to claim and vindicate his Rights in Eccleſiaſtical matters, he is ſo fearful of offending the Pope, that he ſeeks all poſſible excuſes even whiſt he his claiming his own. Firſt, he lays the fault on his Predeceſſors, and quotes the Statute made in his Grandfathers time: In the next place, the grievous complaint of the Com-
as *Ed. 3.* c. 1.

The Difference between the

mons must bear its share; then the injury to private Patrons is call'd in for a pretence, as if that gave rise to the complaint (when all this while the King had power enough from the Rights inherent in the Crown, and from former Statutes, if he durst put it in practice) then (which is a wonderful Instance of his fear to offend the Pope) for a farther excuse, he sets up a claim for his people, to the prejudice of his Negative voice; the greatest and choicest flower of the Crown for in the Statute of Provisors of that year, he makes the Commons to alledge; nor is there any mark of his dislike, but rather assent to it, so desirous he was of an excuse toward the Pope, that the Right of the Crown of England, and the Law of the said Realm is such, that upon mischiefs and damage which happened to his Realm, he ought and is bound of the accord of his said People in his Parliament thereof, to make Remedy and Law in voiding the mischiefs and damage which thereof cometh, &c. Then the King goes on himself to alledge his own Oath to see the Laws executed, &c. as the Reader may satisfy himself more fully from the Statute at large, as it appears in all our Books.

I suppose this may sufficiently shew how fearfully that great and Generous Prince (not subject to vain fears) went about to remedy that Inconvenience. What Fruit he reap'd from the hazard he adventur'd, and how effectual that great Medicine (our Author so highly commends to us) was, may be conjectur'd by the need there was of another Statute of Provisors, the very next Parliament, viz. the 27 year of his Reign. It would be too tedious to the Reader and my self, to quote all the Statutes of that kind. Instead of others which it were easie to produce, I shall only add that of the 16 of Rich. 2. cap. 5. Where the Commons of the Realm having complain'd of the intolerable Tyrannies and Oppressions of the Sec of Rome; go on to pray the King, and him require by way of Justice that he would examine all the Lords in the Parliament, as well Spiritual as Temporal, severally and all the States of the Parliament, how they think of the Cases aforesaid, which be so openly against the Kings Crown, and in derogation of his Regality; and how they will stand in the same Cases with our Lord the King, &c. Whether this Examination was in order to the Attainder of the Persons, or Suspension of the Votes of the Dissenters,

Dissenters, or some other purpose, I will not take upon me to enquire. Certainly considering the Greatness of the Peerage of England at that time, such a way of procedure shews the greatness of the mischief which was desired to be redrest. But the continued complaint and fresh Endeavours for Remedy, do likewise as evidently demonstrate that none of our Kings ever found an effectual Cure, till the time of Henry the VIII. who yet, although he retain'd the Roman Profession of Faith, denying temporal Subjection to the Pope, became liable to that Deprivation and Censure, and all that Spiritual Thunder which so severely fell upon him, and has since exercised his Successors.

But those our Princes who came after him, having generally been of the Reformed Religion, which they of Rome have declared to be Heresie; the practices among us however exorbitant, will not fall under our present consideration. I shall therefore pass over to our Neighbours of France; and examine how well the Priviledges of the Gallican Church have stood the most Christian Kings in stead; which will readily be seen if we look into their Histories: nor will we seek farther than the last Age. Henry the Third we know had difficulty enough with the Catholick holy League, opposed not only by the high-flown Jesuited Romanists, but the Bulwarks of Regal Authority, the Loyal Doctors of the Sorbon, who being Seventy in number, unanimously decree, *nemine contradicente*, That the Subjects of France were freed from their Oaths of Allegiance and Obedience made to Henry the Third: And also that the said Subjects may legally and with a safe Conscience arm and unite themselves, collect and raise money, &c. Which Decree of the good Doctors was ratified by his Holiness in his Bull of Excommunication, which suddenly followed; and was pursued to such Extremities by the Leaguers, that they were not only content to subject that Kingdom to the Yoke of Spain, but in despite of the *Salick Law*, endeavour that the Infanta Clara Eugenia Elizabetha should succeed unto the Crown; and though the King turn'd Covenantant himself, and Establish'd the Oath of Union in the Assembly of the Three Estates, and personally swore to it, making it a Fundamental Law of the French Nation, that only a Catholick should be capable to succeed unto the Crown

David. l. 10.
Conclus. Facult Paris.

D^r Aubigne.
Tom. 3.

The Difference betwixt en the

Crown, yet notwithstanding this, the said *Henry* the Third could not escape the Anger of his Holiness, and what is consequent thereto, the being d. priv'd of his Kingdom and his Life, massacred by *J. Clement*, the *Jacobin*-Monk. To him we know succeeded *Henry* the IV. who after great struggling, and the same opposition from the Unanimous Determination of the Loyal *Sorbon*-Doctors, in their general Congregation, who *May 7. 1590.* Declar'd *Henry of Bourbon* incapable of the Crown, though he should obtain Absolution from the Church, and that the French were oblig'd to keep him from the Crown; that all who favour him are in perpetual mortal sin; and all that are slain in the Cause against him shall obtain an everlasting Reward, and be crown'd with the Trophies of Martyrdom. This *Henry*, Hazy, having by the blessing of God, and a good Sword, added possession to his Claim, and in spite of opposition made himself Master of France: yet this new *Salick Law* stood still in his light, and a Crown was not to be had but at the price of a Mass: For though it be a receiv'd *Maxime*, That the Crown removes all taint of Blood, it cannot of Opinion. One now would have expected in this instance, that the Church Doors should have flown open to receive this Royal Convert: but the case is far otherwise. Five years diligent agitation in the Court of *Rome*, and attendance on three several Popes, can scarcely compass this great Work of bringing a straid Royal Sheep into the Fold of Christ. The difficulties made herein will abundantly appear, as from the Histories of that Age, so more particularly from *Cardinal D' Ossat* and *Perron's* Memorials. And truly 'tis remarkable when the matter was adjusted, to what submissions the King in his Representatives was fain to descend: How his Commissioners in his Name and Behalf, beg Remission prostrate on their Faces; and being drub'd and bastinado'd, as the insulting *Italians* word it, or as the French confess, being switch'd by his Holiness, hardly obtain'd an Absolution for their Matter; who was farther oblig'd to renounce his former Inauguration and Absolution given him in France, and to swear the Extirpation of the Protestants. But when all this was done, the Pacification was not fully made; but this mighty Prince fell by the Point of a *Rasile*, and the implacable Papacy, as is notorious to the World.

The

The Successor to these, *Lewis the XIII.* having before him, the Catastrophe of his two immediate Predecessors, one would have thought might reasonably be allowed some farther Provision for his Safety and Assurance of the Allegiance of his People: and to this end the Third Estate drew up an Oath of Fealty to be taken by all his Subjects: but it is not imaginable with what fury this was oppos'd by the Pope and Clergy; what violent and long Harangues were made in the House of Peers and Commons against it; what Gratulations were sent to the Clergy of *France* by his Holiness for their generous opposition of that Oath, complementing it as a Defence of his, and therein the Churches Rights. The Speech of Cardinal *Perron* is a sufficient account of this matter, which was at large answered by the Royal Pen of King *James*, and therefore needs no new unraveling.

*Harangue au
tiers Estat.*

But beyond all this, there is a particular which is not commonly taken notice of, and deserves not to be forgotten: 'Tis this: After the *Cardinal* in his long Harangue in the Name of the Clergy of *France*, had baffled and exposed the power of Kings, and endeavoured to subject both it and their Persons also to the Discipline and Coercion of the Church; and concluded that at best, the point of Princes being exempt from Deposition was barely Problematical, and consequently could not be matter of an Oath: The King fearing to provoke so strong and eager a party, called the aforesaid Bill for the Security of his Person, to his own hearing, and made an express Inhibition to the several Estates, that they should not proceed farther in it, or sign or publish what they had drawn up. But this would not serve the turn, the Ecclesiasticks would not sit down with a drawn Battail; but insolently depute in their Names the Bishop of *Angers*, with other Prelates, and *Capitulars*, among whom were *Cardinal Perron* and *Sourdis*; where *Cardinal Perron* being the Spokes-man, told the King to his Face, That this matter lately contested was a point of Doctrine; and though in his Speech to the Third Estate he had declar'd it to be Problematical; now to cut it short, he asserted that the power of the Pope was full, as y^e most full and direct in spirituals, and indirect in Temporals: That whosoever maintained the contrary were Schismaticke and Hreticke, even those of the Parliament who had suck'd

Recueil tres
exact & curi-
eux de tout ce
que l'est fait
& passé de sin-
gulier & me-
morable, en
l'Assemblée
Generale des
Estates tenus,
à Paris en
l'annee 1614.
Par Florim.
Rapine.

the

The Difference between the

Pag. 36.

the M^{rk} of Tours. That if the King would not immediately cast out the Arrest of the Parliament, and would not rage out of the Registers the Conclusions of the Kings Officers, he had in Commission and charge to say, That they would depart from the Assembly of Estates; and that being there as in a National Council, they would excommunicate all those who were of a contrary Opinion to the Proposition which affirmed that the Pope could depose the King. And if the King would not suffer them to proceed with Ecclesiastical Censures, they would do it notwithstanding, though they were to suffer Martyrdom. We have here (if I mistake not plain enough the Judgment of the Church of France. Would we see what was the Opinion of the Pope upon it? Upon the 16. of Febr. there was brought, and opened, and read in the Chamber of the Clergy, a Brief of th. Pope Paul the V. bearing date the last of Mar. 1615. *sub anno Piscatoris*; wherein his Holiness returns his Solemn Thanks to the Clergy of France, for what they had done against the Article of the Third Estate, wherein his power was concerned, desiring them to persevere in the same mind.

Pag. 40.

Which Brief, by the way, was read in their Chamber without any leave had or ask'd from the King or Council. And truly if the most Christian King be treated thus by his Subjects in duty to their Sovereign the Pope notwithstanding the primogeniture, and other pretences of that Crown; what shall we of England expect, who stand in worse circumstances? We must not wonder or take it amiss; that Pope Urban the VIII. in the year 1626. by his Bull bearing date May 30. forbid all *Roman Catholics* to take the Oath of Allegiance. And since th. happy Restoration of his present Majesty, when several of his Subjects of the Papal Profession, offered by Oath (wherein the Supremacy is wholly wav'd) to assure their duty and Obedience, that the Pope and his Agents look'd upon this Overture as Apostacy from him, that is, from the Christian Faith: and persecuted all those who are concerned in the Proposal; of which see the *Controversial Letters*, and the late History of the Irish affairs. Nor lastly, will it be at all strange, that at this day many eminent Persons of the Roman Religion, who by the great Indulgence of the State, notwithstanding their Differences in Judgment and Interest from the rest

First Controversial Letters.

of the Kingdom) are, upon assurance given of their Loyalty by the easie Test of promising it under the Seal of an Oath, permitted to have the personal and free use of their Votes in the Judging of Causes in their last Appeal, and what is the highest Trust imaginable, in the making of Laws, and to sit as Peers in the great Council of the Nation, do now refuse to give the aforesaid Assurance by taking the Oath of Allegiance; though that be the general Condition previous to Session, laid not only upon them, but on all the rest of their Fellow-Subjects.

It is not for me, or any private person to determine of the Rights of our Superiours; but by Duty and Allegiance we are obliged to defend them. This I think may be laid down as a Maxim. That no Power is of any moment, when set in Opposition to its Superiour; and that all Pleas follow the last Appeal. So that if the Spiritual Sovereign be plac'd above the Temporal, 'tis vain to talk of any Rights the Temporal can plead in prejudice unto the other. And to speak the whole matter in one short word, Princes can have no sufficient powers against Encroachments from the Papacy; who, if the Popes and Churches pretensions stand good, whenever they think fit to interpose, have no power at all. And thus much be said upon this Head of Enquiry.

ENQUIRY V.

Whether Religion was the Cause of the Massacre in France, and Rebellion in Ireland?

I no way doubt that Mens exorbitant Passions and Desires are the Cause of all the Disturbance in the World. According to that of the Apostle, *Whence are Wars and Fightings among you? Are they not from your Lusts that war in your Members?* James 2. ; But our Author knows well, that besides the leading principal original Cause, there is an immediate evident one, which is joyn'd to the Effect; which alone in a discourse of this nature we enquire after. Now if it be manifest that his Holiness the Pope, the Supreme Monarch of the Church, laid his Command upon, and with great instance dealt with, the French King to destroy the Hugonots, and had his Promise and Engagement that he would destroy them; and if after he had

The Difference between the

done this, it be certain that the News of the performance was received with Joy and Exultation by the whole Roman Court, and Pope himself; I hope it will be sufficiently manifest to whom the Action is to be imputed. I do not say that his Holiness either design'd the manner of the Massacre, or was privy to all the circumstances of it before hand. But if I bargain with a Russian that he shall kill such a person, whom I take to be mine enemy; though I do not contract whether he shall do it with a Pistol, or a Sword, or with Poison; yet if the Murder at my Instance be committed, no sober Judge or Jury would doubt to find me guilty in the case.

Vita del gloriosissimo Papa Pio quinto, P. 91.

Now that the Pope was thus far accessary to that bloody Carnage, appears from *Jerom Catena*, Secretary to Cardinal *Alexandrino*, in his Life of *Pius V.* dedicated to Pope *Sixtus V.* who mentions his Holiness his engaging in this matter, as an instance of his pious solicitude for the Advantage of the Church. In particular he tells us, *That when his Master Cardinal Alexandrino, that Popes Nephew and Legat in France, with great instance moved the breaking of the intended Marriage with the King of Navar; and to divert it perswaded a Match of Margarett Daughter of France, with Sebastian King of Portugal; In answer to this, the King taking the Legat by the hand, bid him assure his Holiness Pius, that he concluded this Marriage for no other purpose than to take vengeance of the Enemies of God, and to chastise his Rebels, as the end should manifest: and that he did all this to obey the Instructions and the Counsels of Pius, who perpetually incited him not to endure such injuries committed against God and the Crown: and that he took this Course because he knew no better way to compass his end, than this to make those of the Religion sicure, having tried all other means. Then pulling a Diamond of great value off his Finger, he said to the Legat, Take this as a Pledg and Security of my Promise, and the Faith which I will alway bear to the Apostolick See, and to execute all that I have said against these impious Wretches. He adds farther, That the Legat excused himself from receiving the Ring, pretending that he had kept himself from taking any thing from the hands of any Prince to whom he had been sent: and besides, that he took the Word of so Great a King to be the surest Pledg and Security: But that the Ring was sent to Rome by the King unto Cardinal Alexandrino*

alexandrino (though it came not till after the death of his Uncle Pope Pius) in a Casket, on which were engraved these words, Non minus hæc solida est pietas: Nec pietas possit mea sanguine solvi.

So that if we will believe either the Pope who directed, or King of France who executed this Tragedy, 'twas Piety and Religion which was the Motive to it.

As to the espousal and owning of this bloody Fact after its execution, when there came an account of it to the next Pope Gregory XIII. I may not hope to express the Joy it brought unto his Holiness, since the Historian tells us that it surpasses the comprehension of Speech, and as he terms it, it was *indiscible*. It created a Jubilee in its liberal importance; and whereas the Tongue was unable to speak out the full Resentment, Gesture and Action were called in to use their Rhetorick; and not only all the pompous Solemnities of a Procession and Triumph, of which the Head of the Noble *Coligni*, sent as a Token from France to his Holiness, was a mean and inconsiderable circumstance: but Almighty God was put into the Pageantry, and a solemn Thanksgiving at the Church of St. Lewis, was an instance of the grateful piety of the Pope and Cardinals on this occasion.

Mezeray, An.
1572.
Thuan Hist.
l. 53.

Let me make this matter plainer, if it may be, by an Instance taken from our own Histories, which *ad hominem* will I assure my self be conclusive beyond controul. It is the case of *Thomas Becket*, wherein K. Henry the second being no farther concerned, than that after intolerable affronts and perpetual vexations given him by that insolent Prelate, he was in passion, and asked if he should never be rid of so inveterate an enemy, though (as *Baronius* relates it) the *irregular deed that followed was neither acted by his will or consent, nor done by any contrivance of his*; yet because the Murder of that Prelate was consequent to his impatient words; the poor King was by the Judgment of the Church declared guilty of the whole Fact, and by the sentence of the Popes Legates, (besides the sacrificing several Rights of the Crown, and payment of large sums of money,) made to walk bare-foot several miles to the Cathedral at *Canterbury*; where attending a whole day and night without sleep or food, he received from the Monks his Sub-

Stow.
Speed Chron.
in Hen. 2.

Brown in An.
1167.

The Difference between the

jects, on his naked back, above fourscore lashes. And if a King was thus far Criminal for occasioning, though beside his intendment, the death of one of his rebellious Subjects; what shall we say of that Universal Pastor, who directly advised and commanded the slaughter and destruction of so many thousands of all Degrees, Ages and Sexes, whereof a great part were certainly more innocent than that unhappy man, whose blood was esteemed so sacred, could be thought to be?

Having given this account of the Massacre in *France*, let me see next whether my Author be in the right in his account of the Rebellion in *Ireland*. Where not to rip up that old sore, and shew how the *Romish* Factors fomented and blowed up those unhappy flames; and the Pope having absolved by his Bulls his Majesties Subjects from their Allegiance, took upon himself to be their Prince and General in the person of his *Nuncio*, exercising all Regal Powers, and that not only upon the poor Protestants, but even the Papists also, who were guilty of that mortal sin, the designing to desert Rebellion, and returning to his Majesties Obedience: This I pass over, being the matter of a just History; and shall produce only two Testimonies in evidence to my present Conclusion, and both of them of so early a date, as not to admit that common excuse, which the *Irish* are always ready to offer, that they did not rebel against the King, but fought against his Enemies and Regicides.

The first of these shall be the Brief of Pope *Urban* to *Oneal*, bearing date *Octob. 8.* that is our *Sept. 28. 1642.* which was before the first battel between the King and his Rebels in *England* at *Edge-Hill*. The Brief runs thus.

To his beloved Son Eugenius Oneal. You are accustomed to omit no occasion to testify your singular zeal and endeavour which you derive from your Ancestors of defending the Church. And of this you have given a recent testimony by designing to go into Ireland, to take care of the concerns of the Catholics. Wherefore your Letters came very welcom to me, whereby you signify your intended Voyage; and taking your Assistance from the Divine Assistance, have not less humbly than religiously desired of Us our Apostolical Benediction. We highly commend your constancy against the Hereticks, and sincere Faith; expecting from you in
this

this opportunity, the proofs of your Valour, which have formerly given you renown, and will be exemplary to others. We hope the most High will be at hand to assert your Cause, and will make known his saving health among all Nations. In the mean time, that you may proceed with greater assurance; praying incessantly to the divine Clemency, that he would frustrate the endeavours of your Enemies, we give to you and those others who promote the affairs of the Catholicks in the aforesaid Kingdom, our Benediction; And to all and each of them, if they being penitent are confess, and duly refresh with the holy Communion if it may be had, plenary Remission and pardon of their sins, and also at the point of Death plenary Indulgence. Dated at Rome under the Seal of the Fisher the 8. day of Octob. A. 1642. and of our Papacy 20.

My next proof shall be from a zealous Votary of the Church of Rome, Father O-mahon, in his Apology for the Right of the Kingdom of Ireland, in behalf of the Catholicks against the English Hereticks; and his Exhortation; where after other laudable Documents he thus bespeaks them.

My Country-men of Ireland, Go on and prosper, fulfil the work which you have begun for your Defence and Liberty. Destroy the Hereticks your Enemies, and all their Abettors. You have already killed an hundred and fifty thousand of them in these four last years, I mean from 1641. to this present 1645. wherein I write; the which your Enemies in their Writings roar out and confess, and you acknowledg; and I believe, that more of the Hereticks have been killed, and would to God that all had been so. It remains that you destroy those that yet survive, or at least drive them out of Ireland, that they may no more infect our Catholick Country with their Heresies and Errours.

I shall trouble the Reader no farther on this Head, but desire him to take his choice whether he will believe my Author, who says the Rebellion of Ireland was not for Religion; or his Holinets (whom in this case we may allow to be infallible) who says it was. Or if we will avoid so odious a comparison, whether we will think our Author speaks truth, or Father Mahon, who was not a stranger to the action he talks of, and would be thought to know what belongs to War and Religion, as well as any of his Neighbours. Though, by the way, he also confutes that representation which our Author makes

Disputatio Apologetica de jure regni Hiberniae pro Catholico Hiberniae adversus haereticos Anglos, Auctore G. M. Hiberno Artium et S. Th. magistro, &c. num. 11.

The Difference between the

P. 19.

makes of the small numbers of Protestants murdered by the Rebels; for our Author seems to suggest, *That indeed this thing which we talk of as a Massacre and a War, was only a Scuffle at a Wake, where a few broken shins or heads determined the quarrel; and after the application of a plaister of Diapalma, all was presently made well again.* But there is nothing so manifest, that some Romanists have not the confidence to deny. And truly, they who teach their Votaries in the immediate concerns of their immortal Souls, to renounce all their senses and reason to boot, need not despair of obtruding any thing upon the credulous world.

Vera descriptio modernis status Catholicorum in regno Hibernie & precibus eorum ad sanctissimum Dominum Clementem Papam nonum. Colon Agrippinæ. p. 3.

P. 2.

I know it may be pretended that what is said by Father O'Mahon was written in the heat of a Civil War; and that now the Catholics of Ireland are in a calmer mood, and his Majesties most loyal and obedient Subjects. How far they are so, may be estimated (as from other Instances so in particular) from the address made in their name to Pope Clement the IX. in the year 1667. Which begins with a charge against his sacred Majesty, *that contrary to publick Faith and Concessions granted to the Irish by his Lieutenant, the Duke of Ormond, in the Treaty of Kilkenny, 17 Jan. 1648. soon after his first restitution, he past a cruel Edict, whereby 22 of the 32 Counties of Ireland, which were given away by Cromwell to his fellow Traitors and Servants, were confirmed to them, excluding for ever the Irish; and besides this, that his Majesty had given by the same Injustice the principal Cities and Towns with the remaining Counties of Ireland to his Favourites and Courtiers, particularly the Duke of York, Earl of Falmouth and Arlington.*

After this the said Paper goes on to celebrate the Irish Rebellion, as being from its very beginning most just, and by all divine and humane Law lawful; the Irish being compelled to take up arms for the defence of their Religion and Lives, their attempt being necessary, truly Catholic, and justified not only by the Laws of God and men, but the Judgment of the Christian World, and the Execution of two Popes; a War fitter to be compared to that of the ancient Maccabees, than to be branded with the odious name of Rebellion, &c.

P. 12.

Farther, having reproach'd the Kings of England as Antipopes, the said Paper proceeds to declare that *as the Kings of France had*

had anciently the Sovereign Power in Ireland, and that all the right which the Kings of England can pretend, is derived from thence; as appears from publick Records, and the Peter-pence paid in the Catholick times in England; and that the English can alledge no other title than the Grant of Pope Adrian the IV. to Hen. II. who is averred to have given to the said King the Lordship of Ireland in fee, and upon certain conditions, whereof the first was the preservation of the Catholick Faith, the planting of Vertue, &c. which conditions not being performed, 'tis obvious to conclude, that the right returns entirely to his Holiness.

In the conclusion, this dutiful address having traduced the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy, and that other of later date imputed to Father Walsh and Carron, as its contrivers; and desired that his Holiness, according to the example of Paul the V. who by two Bulls, one in the year 1606, and the other in the year 1607, debarred all Catholicks from the taking the Oath of Allegiance in the time of King James, would also signifie now his will herein. At last the suit is more solemnly directed to his Holiness, by telling him, that the Irish look upon him as their Polar Star, their Sun, and their Physician; and by an allusion bordering upon blasphemy, having made the Popish Irish Church the Vineyard of the Lord of Hosts, and his elect Plants, the Petition calls out to this holy Father (the Vicar, it should seem, of the heavenly one, even in respect of Prayers to be made unto him) to look down, behold, and visit this Vine, &c.

It may here be expected, that from the before-going premisses, I should now draw out Conclusions, and those severely pressing on that whole sort of men, who under divers notions and pretences call themselves Roman Catholicks; that I should exhort our Patriots to oppose sanguinary Laws against inhumane bloody practices, and pecuniary, or other strict restraints against licentious Principles. To put it out of their power to hurt the publick, whose very Religion makes it impossible for them to give any competent security that they will not destroy it. And in a word, to avert those mischiefs by precaution; which if allowed to gather strength, will be so totally destructive, as not to be repaired by after punishments. But this is not my aim, who press the disco-

The Difference between the

veries which I have made, no farther than to arm those who are so fortunate to have been educated in a faith of peaceful Duty and Obedience, not to be tempted by false pretences to desert it; and to perswade all those who have been so unhappy to be entangled in that endless maze of Error, the *Roman Church*, to quit both it and those pernicious guilts, which I have shewed to be its necessary and individual adherents.

I contend not against Names and Notions, but Vice and Mischief; nor am I angry with men, but with that which destroys Human Society. I would not make any Faction look worse than it is. But I can never hold that for Religion which teaches men to violate their Faith, to worship Wood and Stone, to make, and then devour their God, to blow up Senates, to massacre Nations, and kill Kings.

F I N I S.

The Late

7.10.32

APOLOGY

In behalf of the

PAPISTS,

Reprinted and Answered

In behalf of the

ROYALISTS.

The Fourth Edition Corrected.



L O N D O N,

Printed for *Henry Brome*, at the Gun in *S. Pauls*
Church-Yard, the West End. 1675.

69:03

TO THE
AUTHOR
OF THE
Apology.

SIR,

ABout fourscore Years ago, in a time when there were such Apprehensions of the Papists as now there are, (and howsoever they are now, surely then they were not without cause) some of your Predecessors to palliate the matter, and to make their Governours more secure of them, writ a Book to this effect, that Catholicks are to imploy *no other Arms against their Prince but the Arms of Christians, viz. Tears, and Spiritual Means, daily Prayers, and Watchings and Fastings.* So you begin,

*V. Cambdeni
Annals. Anno
1536. concer-
ning Babing-
ton's Conspi-
racy.*

[My Lords and Gentlemen, The Arms which Christians can use against Lawful Powers in their severity are only Prayers and Tears.]

We cannot say that you write your Book for the same end as they did. But we do not like it, that you jump so together in the same Beginning.

[Now since nothing can equal the infinity of those we have shed, but the cause, viz. to see our dearest Friends forsake us, we hope it will not offend you, if (after we have a little wip'd our eyes) we sigh out our Complaints to you.]

The Papists Apology answered

Of the Cause of your Tears, we shall say more anon. Of the Quantity of them, you say very extravagantly, *Nothing can equal the infinity of those we have shed.* For you might have excepted those of the Protestants in Queen *Maries* days, or of them that suffered in the late Irish Rebellion. You ought to have excepted the Tears of your Fabulous Purgatory: and yet those are said to be short of *Infinity*. But you Jesuits love to be Hyperbolic, whether ranting or whining; as if that Religion which obliges you to damn all other Christians, had likewise forbidden you to speak like other Men.

[We had spoke much sooner, had we not been silent through Consternation to see you inflamed (whom with reverence we honour) and also to shew our submission and patience, which used no sleights nor tricks to divert the Debates of Parliament: for no body can imagine where so many of the great Nobility and Gentry are concerned, but something might have been done; when as in all Ages we see things of publick advantage by the managers dexterity nipt in the bud, even in the very Houses themselves. Far be it from Catholics to perplex Parliaments, who have been the Founders of their Priviledges, and all ancient Laws: Nay Magna Charta it self had its rise from us, which we do the less boast of, since it was not at first obtained in so humble a manner.]

In the same Roman Style you commend your own silence and patience. You boast that you have been the Founders of the Parliaments Priviledges, and all ancient Laws. Of the first, let every man believe as he sees cause. But the second we cannot allow, in either sense, whether you mean it of your selves, or of your Predecessors.

For as now in your Church, men are of two sorts, even so they were heretofore in this Realm. There were some that wholly minded the common interests of Christian Religion and Civil Government. Others were *Papalini*, asserters and promoters of the Popes usurpations. They which acted in those first capacities were not more your Predecessors than Ours. They which acted in the other were truly and only Yours.

You say,

[We sung our Nunc Dimittis when we saw our Master in his Throne, and you in your deserved Authority and Rule.]

'Tis

in behalf of the Royallists.

3

'Tis very well. And yet * some of you sung your *Venite Exultemus* when you saw his blessed Father upon the Scaffold. But what of that? since the Son is King, who is not glad † that he is King? or whom would it not grieve to have his Loyalty called in question?

[Nor could any thing have ever grieved us more, but to have our Loyalty call'd into question by you even at the instigation of our greatest adversaries.

[For we must suffer let it be by you alone; for this is a double Death to us of Honour, to have their Enemies not only accusers, but for their insulting Judges also.]

Sir, he that is loyal, and a man of Honour, has no cause to fear Death, double or single. For our Kings have always declared * that they put no man to death for Religion. Therefore if you truly fear Death, it is for Treason. If you only pretend this, it is a Calumny. Either way you are no friend to the Government, for all your pretences to Honour and Loyalty.

[These are they that by beginning with us, murdered their Prince, and wounded you: and shall the same method continue by your Approbation?

We are sure you mean well; though their design be wicked; but never let it be recorded in Story, that you forgot your often Vows to us, in joining with them that have been the cause of so great Calamity to the Nation.]

How far it is true, that the Kings Murderers began with you, we shall consider anon. But it seems you take the liberty of bestowing that Character upon whom you please; that no man hereafter may dare move for the Execution of any Law against you, for fear of being said to continue the Method of the Kings Murderers.

As for any Vows that we have made to you, whatsoever they are, you are more sure of them than we can be of any that you make to us; for we have no Pope to dispense with them. Neither is it recorded in Story, * that English Protestants ever join'd with the Enemies of their Nation.

[Of all Calumnies against Catholicity, we have admir'd at none so much, as that their Principles are said to be inconsistent with Government, and they themselves thought ever prone to Rebellion.]

*Tis a Calumny of yours to call those things Calumnies,

* Answer to Philanax, p. 85

† So Argyle said, Let them take all, since my Lord the King is come home in peace.

* K. James Premonition, p. 136. of his Works.

* V. Inf. K. Charles his Testimony in his Letter to the Prince.

The Papists Apology answered

nies which are true, and which you cannot deny without such a presumption as we should much *admire* in you if it were not so very ordinary. Concerning your *Principles*, where should we look for them, but in your Councils, your Decretals, and the Books of your Divines? In each of these we are taught, that the Pope has a power to depose Kings, and to discharge Subjects from their Allegiance: which Doctrines are utterly *inconsistent with Government*: for whosoever believes them, no Prince can be secure of him. But whosoever is a Papist, is bound to believe them. And he that has imbib'd this Faith, may well be *thought ever prone to Rebellion*.

Const. Lateran.
IV. c. 3.

The Council of *Lateran* under Pope *Innocent III.* expressly ordains, that in case any Prince be a favourer of Hereticks, after admonition given, *The Pope shall discharge his Subjects from their Allegiance, and shall give away his Kingdom to some Catholick, that may root out those Hereticks, and possess his Kingdom without contradiction.* 'Tis observable, that this Pope was himself a deposer of Kings, namely of *John King of England*, and of *Otho IV.* the Emperour, and also that this Council which made Rebellion a Duty, was the first that made Transubstantiation an Article of Faith.

Bellarmin. in
Darel. c. 31.

Next for the Bulls and Decrees of your Popes, which according to *Bellarmin* are sufficient to *make that to be a sin which is not sin, or not to be sin which is sin*: it would be tedious to instance in all that could be produc'd to this purpose.

From *Gregory VII.* downward, such a Trade was driven of deposing Kings, that no weak Prince could wear his Crown, but at the Pope's Courtship. And that it might never be otherwise, Pope *Boniface VIII.* declares it for Law in these words: *† We say, and define, and pronounce, that it is absolutely necessary to Salvation, for every humane Creature to be subject to the Bishop of Rome.* Which Oracle is thus interpreted by *Bertrand*; Every humane Creature, (i. e.) Every Magistrate must be subject, &c. (i. e.) must submit himself to be deposed, when the Pope thinks fit. And that the Gloss doth not injure the Text, it appears by the

† *Extrav. de
Aparato &
Ord. c. 1.
Hanc animum
• Pet. 2. 3.
omni adpo-
mum alioq.
Vulg. Lat.
Omni humana
Creatura.*

Tenor

Tenor of the Decree; especially by those words about the middle of it, that the *Spiritual Power is to order the Worldly Power, and to judge it, if it be not as it ought; according to that in Jeremy, I have set thee over Nations and over Kingdoms, &c.* In which suppletive, &c. these words are wound up; *To root out, and to pull down, and to destroy and to throw down, to build and to plant.* All which powers this Law-giver of yours endeavoured himself to exercise. *He endeavour'd, saith Platina, to give and take away Kingdoms, to expel men, and to restore them at his pleasure.* Jer. i. 10.
Plat. in Vit.
Bonif. VI. l.

Agreably to this Doctrine and Practice your great Canonist *Lancelottus* teaches you, *That the Pope may depose Kings and Emperours, and transfer their Kingdoms and Empires from one Line to another* Line. in Tem-
pla. ann. J. adic. Which wholsom Doctrine, no doubt, l. i. c. i. Sect. 4. as well as the rest of his Book, *Pope Pius IV. has made authentick by his unerring Approbation.* Ib. in Pref.

Lastly, for your Divines, they have generally owned it; and many of them have written large Books in defence of it. We do not tell you this as news, for your Clergy-men know it already; but that your Lalty may not be ignorant of it, we shall quote them some few of the greatest Doctors of your Church in this Age. And we shall leave it upon you to shew them, when and where they were condemned, what Justice has been executed on the Persons, what *Index Expurgatorius* has censur'd the Writings of these Authors. Nay, if you deal honestly, you cannot but confess, that their Works are generally approved, and that their Persons are had in admiration among you that are the guides of the Lay-mens Consciences.

We pass over the gross things of *Mariana's* Book: because, they which once licens'd it for love of the Doctrine; have since condemned it, for fear of their Kings heavy Displeasure.

But pray Sir, who condemned your Cardinals, *Bellarmino* and *Baronius*? who teach you, that the Pope may do with any King, as *Jeboiada* did with *Atbalia*; that is, he may *deprive him first of his Kingdom, and then of his Life.* *Bellarmino* indeed elsewhere expresses it more like a Jesuit, and a Bell. de Reg.
Pont. l. 5. c. 8.
Baron. Anno
200. Sect. 10.
man

*Bill. in Par-
liament c. 3.*

man of distinctions in these words; *The Pope does not allow you not to obey your King, but he makes him that was your King to be not your King;* as who should say, when the Pope has done His part, then you are free to do Yours.

*Suar. in Reg.
M. B. L. 6. c. 1.
Sect. 10.*

Again, who condemn'd your great School-men, *Suarez* and *Valentia*? of whom the one writes against his Majesties Gr nd-Father, that a King Canonically excommunicated, may be deposed or killed by any man whatsoever: the other says, that an Heretical Prince may by the Pope's sentence, be depriv'd of his life, much more of his Estate, and of all Superiority over others.

*Greg. de Pal.
Tom. 2. in
Thomam dis.
q. 17. P. 2.
Philopater.
P. 14.*

Nay, who has condemned our Country-man *Parsons*, or *Cresswell*? (for the high fliers of Popery have been those of our own Nation) by whom this is laid down as a Conclusion of the whole School of Divines and Canonists, and declar'd to be certain, and of Faith; that any Christian Prince whatsoever, that shall manifestly swerve from the Catholick Religion, and endeavour to draw off others, does immediately fall from all Power and Dignity, &c. and that, even before any Sentence of the Pope is pronounced against him; and that all his Subjects whatsoever are free from all obligation of any Oath of Obedience which they have made to him as their lawfull Prince; and that they may and ought (if they be strong enough) to eject such a one from the Government of Christians, as an Apostate, an Heretic, a deserter of Christ, and an enemy of his Commonwealth, &c.

Cardinal Perron went not altogether so high; but yet he held to the Roman Catholick Principle, that Kings may be deposed by the Pope when he sees cause. He seem'd to be of another opinion while Henry IV. was alive: but when He was dead, and a Child was in the Throne, then he ventur'd to declare this publicly in his Oration * on behalf of the whole Clergy of France. † He maintained that this was the current Doctrine in France till the time of Calvin: and for the contrary Doctrine, viz. That Kings are not deposable by the Pope, *Rossieu* * calls it the Paradox of the Lutherans; Perron calls it a Doctrine that breeds Schisms: a gate that leads into all Heresie; and so he holds in so high a degree of detestation,

* *See. 17. c. 6.*
† Note that the Pope sent him thanks for it, and King James writ in answer to it, that solid Defence of the Rights of Kings
* *Ross p. 81.*

that rather than yield to it, he and his fellow Bishops would chuse to burn at a Stake.

But how has this Doctrine taken among the Papists in our Kings Dominions? It has not taken with some of them, either because you have not thought it seasonable for you to instruct them in it; for Doctrines of this sort are then only proper to be inculcated, when they may do execution, or else because your Instruction has been over rul'd by some better Principle; as we doubt not there have alwayes been some of your Church, in whose generous breasts the Englishman has been too strong for the Papist. But yet this Doctrine has taken with others, and many of them have practis'd according to it, as we shall shew you hereafter; and many more would have been practising, if there had not been something to hinder them or deter them. For 'tis allowed by your Divines, as a very good Reason, for Catholics to omit the Duty of Rebellion, *if they are not strong enough to go through with it.* So *Banner* excuses our English Catholics, and so *Belarmin* does the Primitive Christians. Nay your Casuists say, if there be any notable danger of Death or Ruine, without which you cannot perform it, that then you are not bound to endeavour it. Long may these good Reasons continue; for if these were remov'd, we know not how far we might trust you. For one of your Brethren, another poisoner of the People, has been so forward already since his Majesties Restauration, as to declare in Print, that in case your Pope should take upon him to Deprive our King, he would not meddle between them. *I leave that Question,* saith he, *to be decided by the two supreme Powers, the Pope, and the King, when occasion shall be for it.*

Bell. de Rom. Pont. l. 5. c. 7.

Watson's Quodlibets, p. 255. and 295. &c. out of Banner's Valentia, and Parsons.

The Exhortation in the afternoon, p. 22.

[My Lords and Gentlemen, had this been a new Scill not known before, something perchance might have been doubted; but to say this as their doers that have governed the civilised world, is the miracle of miracles to us.]

Sir, we know not how to cure your wonder, but by shewing you 'tis unreasonable. For you call it a *Miracle* that men judge according to good Evidence. Who doubts leis

B

of

The Papists Apology answered

F. His speech
in Parliament,
p. 504. of his
Works.

of the dangerousness of your Principles and Practices, than they that have read most, and had most experience of them? We can give you no greater instance, than in King James of blessed Memory, who was no stranger to you either way, and this is his Judgment of you: *That as on the one part, many honest men seduced with some Errors of Popery, may yet remain good and faithful Subjects: So on the other part, none of those that truly know and believe the whole Grounds and School conclusions of their Doctrines, can ever prove either good Christians or good Subjects.*

But pray Sir, when was it that you govern'd the civilized World? For the Eastern and Southern Churches never own'd your Government, nor yet the Western, while learning flourish'd: but when Barbarity had over-run it, then Popery grew up by degrees, and made it more barbarous both in Ignorance and in Cruelty. Then came in those Doctrines of Transubstantiation, &c. Then came in those Papal Usurpations, &c. which the World, being again Civiliz'd, hath partly thrown off, and partly reduced into more tolerable terms.

[Did Richard the First, or Edward Longshanks suspect his Catholics that served in Palestine, and made our Country's Fame big in the Chronicle of all Ages: or did they mistrust (in their dangerous absence) their Subjects at home, because they were of the same profession? could Edward the Third imagine those to be traitorous in their Doctrine that had that care and duty for their Prince, as to make them (by statute) guilty of Death in the highest Degree, that had the least thoughts of ill against the King? he pleased that Henry the Fifth be remembered also, who did those Wonders, of which the whole world does yet resound, and certainly all History will agree in this, that 'twas Oldcastle he feared, and not those that believed the Bishop of Rome to be Head of the Church.]

Daniel's Hist.
Vol. I.

The Reigns of those Kings whom you speak of, were in those dark times; when all Goodness declin'd, and Corruptions were daily growing upon us. Richard the First, being told he had three wicked Daughters, Pride, Covetousness, and Lechery, said he could not match them better than among your Templers, Fathers, and Friars. Edward the First out-law'd the whole Clergy of this Realm, for refu-

in behalf of the Royallists.

9

sing to pay the King any Taxes, because the Pope had forbidden them to do it. And both those other Princes whom you mention, made Laws against his Usurpations. *Edward* the Third made a notable one of this kinde, by advice of that very Parliament, in which he enacted his *Laws against Treason*. And certainly *Henry* the Second was more vex'd with *Becket*, than ever *Henry V.* feared *Oldcastle*. We doubt not, those Kings had many good Subjects, and our King hath some better than you seem to be. But they differed not in Religion, as you do from ours: And yet then, your Faction was alwayes encroaching where it was suffered, and dangerous where it was opposed.

Did not your Pope force King *John* to do him homage for *England*? Did he not wrestle with *Edward I.* for the Sovereignty of *Scotland*? hath he not often laid claim to the Kingdom of *Ireland*? If the old Gentleman in a pet should go to turn out his Tenant, what would our King have left when these are disposed of?

[We will no longer trouble you with putting you in minde of any more of our mighty Kings who have been feared abroad, and as safe at home as any since the Reformation of Religion. We shall only add this, that if Popery be the enslaving of Princes, France still believes it self as absolute as Denmark or Sweden.]

The King of *France* will believe what he pleases, but not all that you say of him. For he cannot but know, that the Pope gave away that Kingdom from some of his Predecessors; and maintained War in it against his Grandfather, till he brought him to his rearms. And why hath not his Holiness dealt so with him that now is? partly for the sake of his Religion; but chiefly for fear of a storm, lest his Coine should do that which *Lewis* the Twelfth's only threatned in the Inscription of it, *PERDAM BABYLONIS NOMEN*.

[Nor will ever the House of Austria abjure the Pope to secure themselves of the fidelity of their Subjects.]

For the *Austrian* Princes that are so link'd to the Pope, and

Walsingham.
Edw. I. 1198.

15. E. 3. Vide
Statute of
Provisors;

* *Mat. West.*
1301.

Tbu. Hist. L. 7.

The Papists Apology answered

The Spaniard holds the Kingdoms of *Navar*, and of *Naples*, and *Sicily*, only by the Popes gift, by which he should have *Ireland* too, and *England*, but that the right Heir keeps them from him.

and whole *Subjects* are all Papists; you suggest a mad way to *secure* themselves by firing their Countrey about their ears.

But what is this to *England*? where *since the exclusion* of that trash, which you call the *Catholic Faith*, the King and the greatest part of his people are no Papists, and have had so much trouble and danger from them that are. May not Reason and experience teach us to fear, that having to do with the same kinde of Adversaries, we may still have some trouble, some and dangerous Enemies? No, we have none to fear but our selves, if we may believe you. For say you,

[We shall always acknowledge to the whole world, that there have been as many brave English in this last Century, as in any other place whatsoever: yet since the Exclusion of the Catholic Faith there hath been that committed by those, who would be vain called Protestants, that the wickedest Papist at no time dream't of.]

Pray Sir what may that be? For you have murdered Kings, and them of your own Religion, four or five in this Realm since the Conquest. (not to speak of those numbers elsewhere) But that was in the growing Age of Popery. In later times, have you so soon forgot our Kings Grand-Father *Henry IV.* murdered by *Ravalliac*, or his Predecessor *Henry III.* murdered by *Friar Clement*? And the people you have kill'd up by whole Families and Townships. Witness *England, Ireland, France, Piedmont*, which you will hear of elsewhere. These things have been done by Papists broad-awake, and what must that be which the wickedest of them never dream't of?

[It was never heard of before, that an absolute Queen was condemned by Subjects, and those styled Peters, or that a King was publicly tryed and Executed by his own people and Servants.]

Walſingham,
Hist. Ed. I.
2306.

First you tell us of the Queen of Scots put to Death in Queen *Elizabeth's* Reign. It was by the same colour of right, we suppose, that *Wallis* suffered in *Edward the First's* Reign, namely of that Sovereignty that our Princes challenged

in behalf of the Royallists.

11

lenged over Scotland. But *Edward I.* was erewhile a laudable Papist; and *Queen Elizabeth* for all this might be a very good Protestant. Sure we are, that *King James* and *King Charles*, who were nearest concerned in this matter, never imputed the Fault of it to her Religion.

Your other instance is, of that most execrable Murder, committed on the best of Kings, by his own Subjects, and by such as you say, *would fain be called Protestants*. Sir, we *would fain be called* Christians, and Members of the Catholick Church. Would you take it well of a Turk, that should therefore charge our faults upon you? but you do worse then a Turk, in charging these mens faulcs upon us. They were neither then nor since of our Communion, but that blessed Prince was, whom they murder'd. He declared upon the Scaffold, *I dye a Christian, according to the profession of the Church of England, as I found it left me by my Father*. He charged the Princess *Elizabeth*, not to grieve, and torment her self for him; for that would be a glorious Death which he should dye, is being for the Laws and Liberties of this Land, and for maintaining the true Protestant Religion. He died with some Care not to leave you this advantage by his Death; as it appears by these words of his last Letter to his Majesty that now is. *The scandal of the late Troubles which some may object and urge to you against the Protestant Religion established in England, is easily answered to them or your own thoughts in this, that scarce any one who hath been a beginner or an active persecutor of this late War against the Church, the Laws, and me, either was or is a true lover, embracer, or practicer of of the Protestant Religion established in England; which neither gives such Rules, nor ever before set such Examples.*

Letter to
the Prince.

[My Lords and Gentlemen, we know who were the Authors of this last abomination, and how generously you strove against the raging Torrents; nor have we any other ends to remember you of it, but to shew that all Religions may have a corrupted spawn; and that God hath been pleased to permit such a Religion, which our Progenitors never saw, to convince you per chance (whom for ever may he prosper) that Popery is not the only source of Treason.]

But do you indeed know who were the Authors of this last
also.

The Papists Apology and Wered

17. L. Estrange
1619. in Ha-
bernfields
Relation.

* Answer to
the Reasons
for no
Address.

Large
Declaration
concerning
the tumults in
Scotland, p. 3.

* Answers to
the Reasons
for the Votes
of no Address.
† Answer to
Philanax, p. 59

abomination? Pray Sir be plain with us, for in these doubtful words, there seems to be more truth than every man is aware of. The Rebellion that led to it began, we know, in *Scotland*, where the design of it was first laid by † Cardinal *Richelieu* his *Majesties irreconcilable Enemy*. * Then it broke out in *Ireland*, where it was blest with his Holiness's Letters, and assisted by his Nuntio, whom he sent purposely to attend the Fire there. Lastly here in *England*, you did your parts to unsettle the people, and gave them needles occasions of jealousy, which the vigilant Phanaticks made use of, to bring us all into War and Confusion.

Both in *England* and *Scotland*, the special Tools that they wrought with were borrowed out of your Shops.

It was his Majesties own Observation (by which you may guess whose *spawn* they were.) Their *Maxims*, saith he, were the same with the *Jesuites*; their *Preachers Sermons* were delivered in the very phrase of *Becanus*, *Scioppius*, and *Eudæmon Johannes*; their poor Arguments, which they delivered in their seditious Pamphlets printed or written, were taken almost verbatim out of *Bellarmin* and *Suarez*.

In *Ireland*, where you durst do it, you imploy'd Iron and Steel against him; with which you might as well have preserved him, if you had pleased; but you deny'd to do that, (as he tells us; only upon account of Religion) * Then followed the accursed Fact it self, agreed to in the Councils of your Clergy, † contriv'd and executed by the Phanaticks. In vain did the poor Royallist strive against it, for what could he do? when two streams met against him, of which the deepest was that which came from *Rome*, where the false Fisherman drew up all his *Penstocks*, to overwhelm us with those troubles, which, for the advantage of his trade, he had often before endeavour'd, but could never prevail till now to send them pouring in upon us.

[Little did we think, (when your Prayers and ours were offered up to beg a blessing on the Kings Affairs) ever to see that day, in which *Carlos*, *Gifford*, *Whitgrave*, and the *Pendrels*, should be punished by your desires for that Religion which obliged them to save their forsorn Prince, and a stigmatized man (for his Offences against King and Church) a chief promoter

in behalf of the Royallists.

13

promoter of it. Nay lest, did we imagine, that by your Votes Huddleston might be hang'd, who again secured our Sovereign, and others free in their safe Possessions that sat as Judges, and sealed the Execution of that great Prince of happy Memory.]

That many Gentlemen of your Church were not of your party, we do willingly acknowledge; and that some of them in that critical day of Danger, did the King very eminent Service. But so did the Protestants too; therefore you cannot ascribe this to your Religion. Nor does it seem reasonable, that to requite particular persons for their service, we should abandon those Laws which may secure the publick against as great a danger.

To question his Life that had freely exposed it for our Sovereigns, were too great a barbarity for any Christians but of your Sect, or any Age but Queen *Maries* dayes; for then Sir *Nicholas Throgmorton* was indeed so dealt with; but we do not more detest those times than such examples. And we know that his Majesty, without any trespass on his Laws, may protect and reward those persons whom he judgeth deserving it; as well as his Royal Predecessors did, in whose Reigns the penal Laws were made.

*Doleman's
Conference
of Succession,
part 1. p. 137.*

Pray be you as favourable to the *stigmatized Man*, (whom sure you are not angry with for his Offences against King and Church, whatsoever you say;) and if he be now a promoter of any thing that displeaseth you, bear with him, as his Majesty doth; for whom he lately did his utmost against Phanaticks toward the bringing of him in: and he would not willingly live to see the Pope turn him out again.

For the Regicides, be as severe with them as you please; only beware how you tax his Majesties Mercy, for fear you may have need of it.

[We confess we are unfortunate, and you just Judges, whom with our lives we will ever maintain to be so; nor are we ignorant the necessity of Affairs made both the King and you do things, which formerly you could not so much as fancy. Yet give us leave to say we are still Loyal; nay to desire you to believe so; and so remember how Synonymous (under the late Rebellion) was the word Papist and Cavalier; for there was never no Papist that was not deemed a Cavalier, nor no Cavalier that was not called a Papist, or at least judged to be popishly affected.]

Your

The Papists Apology answered

Your fawning upon the Parliament, and commending of your selves, we pass over as things of course. And we equally believe you now, as you did the Phanaticks heretofore, when they called us Papists; or as we did you e'rewhile, when you called them Protestants. For, pray Sir, what did they to be called Protestants? Or what did *we* to be *judged Papishly affected*? And if all *Papists*, as you say, were *deemed Cavaliers*; we hope some of them have had the grace to be ashamed of sic. In *Ireland* there were whole Armies of Irish and English, that fought against his Majesty, solely upon the account of your Religion. In *England* it is true, some came in voluntarily to assist him; but many more of you were *hunted into his Garrisons*, by them that knew you would bring him little help and much hatred. And of those that fought for him, as long as his Fortune stood; when that once declined, a great part even of them fell from him. From that time forward, you that were, *always, all, deemed Cavaliers*, where were you? In all those weak Efforts * of gasping Loyalty, what did you? You complied, and flattered, and gave sugar'd words, to the Rebels then, as you do to the Royallists now. You address your Petitions † to the *Supream Authority of this Nation, the Parliament of the Commonwealth of England*, you assumed * that *you had generally taken and punctually kept the Engagements*. You promised that if you might but enjoy your Religion † you *would be the most quiet and useful Subjects of England*. You prov'd it in these words, * *The Papists of England wou'd be bound by their own Interest (the strongest Obligation amongst wise men) to live peaceably and thankfully in the private exercise of their Consciences; and becoming gainers by such compassions, they could not so reasonably be distrustful, as the Prelatic Party that were losers.* You prov'd it more amply by real Testimonies; which we have no pleasure in remembering, and you would have less in hearing of them. These things were too lately done to be talk't of.

If after all this said and done for your own Vindication, you were still *deemed Cavaliers*, the more was your wrong. But who could help it? all the right we can do you, is, not to believe it.

2 Moderator,
p. 43.

* 1647, 1656,
1659.

† First Moderator, p. 59.

* Second Moderator, p. 41.

† Answer to Philanax,

p. 63. of Father Bret.

† First Moderator, p. 31.

* First Moderator, p. 36.

[We know though we differ something in Religion (the truth of which let the last day judge) yet none can agree with your Inclinations, or are sifter for your converse than we; for as we have as much Birth among us as England can boast of, so our Breeding teaches your way both in Court and Camp: and therefore had not our late sufferings united us in that firm tie, yet our like humors must needs have joyned our hearts. If we err, pity our condition, and remember what your great Ancestors were, and make some difference between us (that have twice converted England from Paganisme) and those other Sects that can challenge nothing but intrusion for their imposed Authority.]

As for Religion, we agree with you in all that is truly Catholic: We differ from you only in not admitting your Innovations. And whether justly, we say also, let the last day Judge. Your Converse, Breeding &c. we heartily respect as far as 'tis English. But we suspect every thing that leans towards a foreign Jurisdiction. And we would be loth, by our kindeness to those things wherein we agree with you, to be drawn into the danger of those things in which we differ from you.

By that flain of your having twice converted England from Paganism, sure you mean that we in this Island have been twice converted by persons sent to us from Rome. Which you will never perswade any one to believe, that dares trust himself to taste of Church History without one of your Fathers chewing it for him. But supposing this to be true, pray what would you infer from it? That because we received good from the Primitive Christians of that place, therefore we should lay our selves open to receive any evil that may happen to us from their degenerate Successors.

[But 'tis generally said, that Papists cannot live without persecuting all other Religions within their reach.

We confess where the name of Protestants is unknown, the Catholic Magistrates (believing it erroneous) do use all care to keep it out: Yet in those Countries where liberty is given they have far more privileges than we under any reformed Government whatsoever. To be short, we will only instance France for all, where they have publick Churches, where they can make what Proselytes they please, and where it's not against Law to be in any charge or employment. Now Holland (which permits everything) gives us, 'tis true, our Lives and Estates, but takes away all trust in Rule, and leaves us also in danger of the Scots whenever be please to disturb our Meetings.]

C

What

The Papists' Apology and Wered

What is *generally* said of the Popish Persecutions, is also generally believed. But Sir, you answer it decentfully. For you tell us of the manner; first, of those Countries *where the name of Protestant is unknown*; and next, of those Countries *where liberty is given*: but you slip over a third sort, namely, of those where the *name of Protestant is well known*, and yet *no liberty is given*. Pray what *liberty* have the Protestants in *Flanders*? We are told they have none: and yet the *name* of them is very well known there. The like may be said of divers other Countries. Nay in *England*, while it was yours, did you give any *liberty* at all? yet the *name of Protestant* was very well known here, and was sufficient for the burning of any one that was known by it. But you say you *will only instance France for all*. Very wisely resolved, for it would not have been for your credit to instance any other. In *France* then, whatsoever liberty the Protestants enjoy, it is by virtue of their Edicts: which how they were obtained, we shall have occasion to minde you; and how they are observed, let the poor *Hugonots* tell you. But if they were observed to the full; should we therefore grant you that liberty which is *against Law*, because they are allowed that which you say is *not against Law*.

K. James Defence of the R ght of Kt gs. p. 479, 480.

In *Holland*, the Papists may have some reason to complain, if their Masters allow them no more liberty than you speak of. For it was chiefly by their hands, that the Spanish yolk was thrown off; which on the contrary, our Papists were so fond of, that for divers years together, we had much ado to keep them from pulling it on upon our necks.

[Because we have named France, the Massacre will perchance be urged against us: but the world must know that was a cabinet plot, condemned as wicked by Catholic Writers there, and of other Countries also; besides, it cannot be thought they were murdered for being Protestants, since 'twas their powerful Rebellion (let their Faith have been what it would) that drew them into that ill machinated destruction.]

The French Massacre, which you next speak of, was a thing of so horrid a cruelty, that, as *Thuanus* tells us,

con-

in behalf of the Royallists.

17

*"considering men, having turn'd over the Annals of the Nations, could finde no example of the like in all Antiquity. * It was cloaked over with shew of the greatest amity in the world; namely of a Marriage between the Houses of Valois and Bourbon; to which all the Chiefs of the Protestants were most lovingly invited. There, after the jollity of Mirth, and carresses of Entertainment, in the dead time of the night, the whole City was in Arms about them; they fell upon all the Protestant Houses and Lodgings; they butchered them without distinction, Men, Women, and Children, till the Channels ran down with Blood into the River: And scarce a Protestant was left alive, except the * Bridegroom and the Prince of Conde; who turned Papists to escape their hands; and yet they could not escape them, the one being poisoned, and the other stabb'd by men of your Religion. This hellish Stratagem, you say, was condemned as wicked by Catholick Writers. It was likewise extoll'd as glorious by Catholick Writers. But pray Sir, what think you of it? you are bashfull in company, but one may guess at your meaning. First, You say it was a Cabinet Plot, a fine soft word, for the butchering of 30000. persons. Next, in answer to them that call it murder, you seem to blame it as a thing done to halves; for what else can you mean by calling it an ill machinated destruction? Lastly, whatsoever it was, that which drew it upon them, you say, was their Rebellion (let their Faith have been what it would.) Nay Sir, it was their Faith (let their Obedience have been what it would) For neither had that King better Subjects than those which were massacred; nor had his Successor errant Rebel than those that did massacre them. Brave Coligni was the first murdered; and his Head was sent to Rome, while his Body (according to his own ominous * wish) was mangled and dragged about the Streets of Paris. The Duke of Guise was chief of the murderers; whose fallious Authority, as you sweetly style it, was as black a Rebellion as ever that Kingdom saw. But to end this Question, whether these men were massacred for Protestant Religion, or for Rebellion; let us take judges between us: for possibly, We*

*Thu. Hist.

l. 13.

*Thu. Hist.

l. 13.

*Guiscard, in his Oration said, It was a great error that they had not cut the Basilick vein

Id. l. 53.

*Thu. Hist. l.

53. Being forewarn'd of the Plot, and advis'd to stand upon his Guard, He mist rather to have his Body drag'd, &c. than to see any more civil Wars in France.

The Papists Apology answered

Defence of
the right of
Kings in his
Works.
p. 479.

may be partial for the one, and You for the other.

First, Of *Rebellion*, a King should be the most competent Judge: hear therefore what King *James* saith, who lived in the fresh memory of those days. *I coud never yet learn (saith he) by any good and true Intelligence, that in France, those of the Religion took Arms against their King. In the first Civil Wars they stood only upon their Guard, they stood only to their lawful Words, and Locks of Defence. They armed not, nor took the Field, before they were perswaded with Fire and Sword, burnt up and slaughtered. Besides, Religion was neither the root nor the rinde of those intestine Troubles. The true ground of the Quarrel was this; During the minority of King Francis II. the Protestants of France were a refuge and succor to the Princes of the Blood, when they were kept from the King's Presence, and by the Power of their Enemies were no better than plainly driven and chased from the Court. I mean the Grandfathers of the King now Reigning, and of the Prince of Conde, when they had no place of safe retreat. In regard of which worthy and honorable Services, it may seem the French King hath reason to have the Protestants in his gracious remembrance. With either Communion or Insurrection the Protestants are not justly to be charged. Certain it is, that King Henry III. &c. by their good Service was delivered from a most extreame and imminent peril of his Life, &c. they never abandoned that Henry III. nor Henry IV. in all the heat of Revolts and Rebellions raised by the Pope, and the more part of the Clergy, &c.*

Then, of *Religion*, since you will allow none but the Pope to be judge, let us hear his Judgment, from *Thuanus*, who was a Roman Catholick, and a most authentick Historian. He tells us the Pope had an account of the Massacre from his Legate at *Paris*, that he read his Letter in the Consistory of Cardinals, that there it was decreed that they should go directly to *St. Marks*, and there solemnly give thanks to Almighty God for so great a blessing conferred upon the Roman See, and the Christian World. That soon after a Jubile should be published through the whole Christian World, and these causes were exprest for it, To give thanks to God for destroying in France the Enemies of the Truth, and of the Church,

Thu. Hist.
1. 53.

Church, &c. In the Evening, the Guns were fired at *St. Angelo*, and Bonfires were made, and nothing was omitted of all those things that use to be performed in the *greatest Victories of the Church*. Some dayes after there was a Procession to *St. Louis*, with the greatest resort of Nobility and People. First went the Bishops and Cardinals, then the Switzers, then the Ambassadors of Kings and Princes; then under a Canopy, went his Holiness himself, with the Emperors Ambassador, bearing up his Train for him, &c. Over the Church Doer was an Inscription set up, in which the Cardinal of *Lorrain*, in the name of the King of *France*, congratulated his Holiness, and the Colledge of Cardinals, &c. for the *p'ainly stupendious effects*, and *altogether incredible events*, of their Councils given him, and of their *assurances sent him*, and of their *twelve Years Wives and Prayers*. Soon after, the Pope sent Cardinal *Orsin* in his name, to congratulate the King of *France*, who in his Journey through the Cities, highly commended the Faith of those Citizens that had to do in the Massacre; and distributed his Holinesses blessings amongst them. And at *Paris*, being to perswade the reception of the Council of *Trent*, he endeavoured it with this Argument, That the memory of the late *Allion* to be magnified in all ages, as conducing to the glory of God, and the Dignity of the Holy Roman Church, might be, as it were sealed by the Approbation of the Holy Synod: for that so it would be manifest to all men that now are, or hereafter shall be, that the King consented to the destruction of so many lives, *not out of hatred or revenge, or sense of any injury of his own, but out of an ardent desire to propagate the Glory of God*. That, what could not be expected whilst the Faction of Protestants stood, now since they were taken away, the Catholick Apostolick Roman Religion, which by the Synod of *Trent* is cleared from the venom of the Sectaries, might be established without Controversie, and without Exception *through all the Provinces of the French Dominion*.

Well spoken, worthy Head of thy Church we will take thy Judgment about cutting of throats at any time;

The Papists Apology answered

time; thou dost not mince the matter, as this English libel of thee doth: who yet is thus far to be commended; that since he durst not say of it as he desir'd, for fear of provoking us, yet he would not call it as it deserved, for fear of too much contradicting thee.

[*May it not be as well said in the next Catholick Kings Reign, that the Duke of Guise and Cardinal, Heads of the League; were killed for their Religion also? Now no body is ignorant, but 'twas their Fattious Authority which made that jealous Prince design their Deaths, though by unwarrantable means.*]

The Duke of *Guise* and his Brother were not killed for their Religion, for they were killed by one of the same Religion, and one that was bent against the Protestants as much as they. Only because he spared the blood of the Protestants your zealots hated him; and so much the more, because a Protestant being his Heir, he would not declare him incapable of the Succession. For these causes, by the Popes consent, these *Guises* (whom he called the *Macchibees of the Church*) entered into an *holy League* against their King; and called in the Succors of *Spain* and *Savoy*, which they paid for with the Rights of the Crown; they maintained a sharp War against him, and did all that was in their power, to deprive him of his Kingdom and Life. Whereupon that *jealous Prince*, (as you favourably call him) for his own preservation, was urged to deal with them, as they had dealt with the Protestants; from whose case, this of the *Guises* is so vastly different, that one would wonder why you should mention it.

But since you have led us thus far out of the way, let us invite you a little farther. The Pope Excommunicated the King for this Action, and granted 9. Years of true Indulgence to any of his Subjects that would bear Arms against him; and foretold, * (as a Pope might do without Astrology) that *e're long he should come to a fearful Death*. The Subjects took Arms, and earned the Indulgence. A Friar took his Knife, and fulfilled the Prediction; by ripping up those Bowels that were alwayes most tenderly affected with kindness to the Monkish Orders. But what joy was there

Henry III.
of France.

Henry. IV.

Tha. Hist.
l. 91.

Ross. p. 170.
A thousand
times worse
than Mahomet
p. 171. From
the beginning of
the world, no
Nation or
State ever
endured such
a Tyrant.

* *Sixtus V.*
quoted his
own Predi-
ction in his
Oration that
follows.

at Rome for this! as if the news of another Massacre had come to Town; one would think so, by the Popes Oration* to his Cardinals: in which he sets forth this work of God (the Kings Murther) for its wonderfulness to be compared with *Christs Incarnation and Resurrection*. And the *Friars* Vertue, and Courage, and fervent Love of God, he prefers before that of *Eleazar* in the *Maccabees*, or of *Judith* killing *Holofernes*; and the murdered King, (who had profest himself to dye in the Faith of the Roman Catholick Apostolick Church) he declared to have died in the Sin against the Holy Ghost. Pray Sir, may it not well be said, that *Papists cannot live without persecuting Protestants*? when we see a Popish King stabb'd and damned for not persecuting them enough, or for doing the work of the Lord negligently.

* Printed at Paris, 1639. by the Princes of the Holy League, and approved by the Sorbon.

[If it were for Doctrine that Hugonots suffered in France, this haughty Monarch would soon destroy them now, having neither Force nor Town to resist his Might and Puissance. They yet live free enough, being even Members of Parliament, and may convert the Kings Brother too, if he think fit to be so. Thus you see how well Protestants may live in a Popish country, under a Popish King: nor was Charlemain more Catholick than this, for though he contends something with the Pope, 'tis not of Faith, but about Gallican Priviledges, which perchance he may very lawfully do.]

[Judge then worthy Patriots, who are the best used, and consider our hardship here in England, where it is not only a Fine for bearing Mass, but death to the Master for having a Priest in his House: and so far we are from preferment, That by Law we cannot come within 10. miles of London; all which we know your great mercy will never permit you to exact.]

You say, if this were true, then this haughty Monarch would soon destroy his Hugonots now. No such consequence, Sir, for he may persecute them, and not destroy them; he may destroy them, but not so soon. Princes use to go their own pace, whilst they are upon their legs; but if any misfortune throws them upon all four, then the Pope gets up and rides them what pace he pleaseth. Nor is this Monarch yet so Catholick as Charlemain was, if he were, he would do as Charlemain did, He would be Patron of all the Bishopricks in his Empire, even of Rome it self, if it were there. He would make the Pope himself know the distance

King. James works p. 483.

Canon Asch. Dist. 63.

The Papists Apology answered

*Fauschet, Anno.
Sot. c. 10. that
the Pope
ador'd him,
not he the
Pope.
Council of
Frankford,
Anno. 794.*

distance between a Prelate and an Emperor. He would maintain the Rights of his Crown, and not chop Logick about *Gallicane Priviledges*, which you say, like a fly Jesuit, that *perchance he may lawfully do*. He would call a Council when he pleased, to separate Errors from the *Faith*: as *Charlem* in himself called a Council against Image Worship, which was then creeping into the Church. This were a good way of *destroying the Hugonots*, by taking away all causes of strife amongst Christians. By any other way than this he cannot destroy them, without the violation of his Laws: which, as they are the only *Forces and Towns*, whereby Subjects ought to be secured against their King: so, since he is pleased to allow them no other, these Laws, backt with his puissance, are forces enough to secure them against their fellow Subjects.

We cannot pass this Paragraph, without observing your Jesuitical ingenuity; how you slight those favours that you have; how you complain of those *hardships* that you have not; and how you insult over the poor *Hugonots*, by comparing with them, who generally would mend their condition by changing with you. Pray, Sir, do not Popish Peers sit in our English *Parliaments*, as well as Protestants in the French? or have you not as free access to our *Kings Brother*, as they have to theirs? Or would you have his Highness to Catechise, as the Abbot had the Duke of *Glocester*? perhaps that you would have. Otherwise, we know nothing but his Highnesses Wisdom and care of his Conscience that guards him from you.

Of the Laws you complain hideously, *Worthy Patriots consider our hardship*. And yet, those very *Laws* you complain of, you never knew executed in your life; and you tell us soon after, that you *know* they never will be. For what cause then were they enacted? Plainly for this cause, to guard the lives of our Princes against your traitorous practices.

[It hath often been urged, that our Misdemeanors in Queen Elizabeths dayes, and King Jam:s his time, was the cause of our Punishment.]

Your

Your *Misdemeanors* ! we cry you me cy, if they were no more ; but that comes next to be argued, whether they were *Misdemeanors* or *Treasons* ?

[We earnestly wish that the party had more patience unler that Princess. But pray consider (though we excuse not their faults) whether it was not a question harder than that of York and Lancaster, the cause of a War of such length, and death of so many Princes, who had most right, *Q. Elizabeth*, or *Mary Stuart* : for since the whole Kingdom had crowned and sworn Allegiance to *Q. Mary*, they had owned her Legitimate Daughter to *Henry the Eighth* ; and therefore it was thought necessarily to follow by many, that if *Mary* was the true Child, *Elizabeth* was the Natural, which must then needs give way to the thrice Noble Queen of Scots.]

Under Queen *Elizabeth*, you wish your Party had more patience ; and we think they needed none ; for in the first 10. Years of her Reign they had no business for it. In all that space of time, which was twice as long as Queen *Maries* Reign, though it was fresh in memory what the Papists had done, yet not one of them suffered Death ; till the Northern Rebellion : which being raised against her, only upon the account of her Religion : it appears that she was the persecuted person : she had the occasion for *Patience* and you would have wished them more Loyalty, if any such thing had been in your thoughts. But perhaps you wish they had so much *patience*, as not to have discovered their design before it was fully ripe for execution. Not unlike. For it appears, you account Rebellion no fault ; by this, that you say, you *excuse not their faults*, and yet you do excuse their Rebellion.

Philopater.
P. 103.

You excuse them, by saying, it was a very hard Question, whether the *Right* of the Crown lay in her, or in the *Queen of Scots* ; for that many thought Queen *Elizabeth* illegitimate. Pray Sir, who thought it ? or when arose that Question ? The Arch-Bishop of York, though a Papist, in his Speech at the publishing of Queen *Maries* Death, said, *No man could doubt of the justness of the Lady Elizabeths Title to the Succession*. The whole Kingdom received her, and owned her as Queen, more generally and freely than ever they did Queen *Mary*. The

Rossie. p. 227.
Faith of them that were pretended to dye for your Religion, where was it ever heard that they denied her to have been the lawful Queen?

D

Neigh-

The Papists Apology answered

* Philip II.
and Henry II.
for them-
selves, and
the Emperor
Maximilian
for his
Brother
Charles.
* Council of
Trent, l. 5.
Anno 1552,

* In his
Letter by
Pargalia,
dated 1560.
May. 5.
* Dated 1570
Feb. 25.
† See the Bull
it self, there is
not the least
mention of
Bastardy in
it.

* James Buon-
compagno.
† Don John.
* Whom his
Holiness had
created Mar-
quess of Lem-
ster, Earl of
Waxford, &c.
The Hist. 64.

Neighbour Kings of Spain and France, and the Emperor offered * Marriage to her, in hopes to have got the Crown by her. The Queen of Scots her self did acknowledge her, and claimed nothing more than to be Heir to her, and so did King James that was her Successor. So that whosoever opposed Queen Elizabeth's Right; if they were English, 'tis apparent they were Rebels; and if they were Papists, we may guess what led them to it. For, the first that Questioned her Title, was Pope * Paul IV. who would not acknowledge her for sundry causes; the chief that he alledged were these. First, Because *this Kingdom is a Fee of the Papacy, and it was undauntously done of her to assume it without his leave.* The second was, because *she was Illegitimate*; for if her Fathers Marriage were good, the Pope must let down his Mill. But after all this, his Successor Pius IV. * did own her, and would have done any thing for her, so she would have owned him. Which because she would not, the next Pope, Pius V. issued out his Bull * against her, and deposed her; not for Bastardy † but for Heresie; that is, for being a Protestant: for which Heresie it was, that the Northern men rebelled against her, and many more of her Subjects disowned her; and some or other were every foot plotting how to take away her life.

True it is, that some of these pretended to do it in favour of the Queen of Scots. But how if that Queen had not been a Catholick? or Queen Elizabeth had not been thought *Illegitimate*? Would a legitimate Protestant have been so contended for? Or would a Popish Bastard have been rejected by them?

Pope Gregory XIII. had occasion to consider this. For his Holiness had a Bastard * of his own to provide for, and another † of the Emperors; no doubt good Catholicks both of them. To one he gave the Kingdom of Ireland, and set out *Stukely*, * with Forces to win it for him. To the other he gave the Kingdom of England, and gave him leave to win it for himself. But what was all this to the *thrice Noble Queen of Scots*? Possibly she might have been preferred to have married one of the two; but then it must have

have been expressely with this condition, that her Son *King James* (who was a Heretick) *should have nothing to do with the Succession.*

When their bubbles were broken, and she was dead, all her *Rights* descended to *King James*; who being as little to the Popes minde, as *Q. Elizabeth* was, *Sixtus V.* only too't no publick notice of Him, but he proceeded with all his might against Her. He curst her afresh, and publisht a *Croisade* against her; and gave the whole *Rights* of her Kingdoms to *Philip II.* King of *Spain.* But neither that Popes Bounty, nor his three Successors Blessings, nor the Spanish Arms, nor the Italian Arts, (for no way was left untried) could ever prevail against Gods Providence; which, till the end of her dayes, kept that *Queen* alwayes fast in her Possession.

At last, *Pope Clement VIII.* seeing there was nothing to be done against her, resolv'd to let her go like a Heretick as she was; and to take the more care that another Heretick should not succeed her. For which cause he sent over two *Breves* into *England*, one to the Clergy, and the other to the Laity, commanding them not to admit any other but a Catholick, though never so near in Blood, to the Succession: that is to say, in plain words, not to admit *King James* to Reign after *Queen Elizabeths* death. So 'tis clear, that your Popes never stuck at that *hard Question* that you speak of.

*Cambden;
Eliz. 1600.*

Let us see what our Countrey-men did; who, as you say, *suffered for it in those dayes.* They did like obsequious Members, at every turn, as their head directed them. They acted for the Papal Interest as far as they were able. They made the *House of Scotland* the Cloke for it, as far as it would reach. And it reacht pretty well, as long as the Title was in *Queen Mary.* But after the Title came to be in *King James,* Pray Sir, name us those Papists, or but one single person of them, that either did or suffered for him; and then you blest us with a discovery.

What then? were they idle for so many years as past between the commencing of his Title, and the Death of

The Papists Apology answered

Queen Elizabeth? Nothing less. For they were as busie as Bees, in contriving how to hasten her death, and how to put him by the Succession. And if it were for his Service, that they would have destroyed Her; pray for whose service was it, that they would have defeated Him? But that will be known by the story.

Soon after his Mothers Death was the Spanish Invasion; which would have defeated him with a Witness, if it had sped; and yet our Papists, both Negotiated * it, and writ in Defence † of it. Afterwards in Scotland your Jesuites procured the Earl of *Huntley* * and others to raise a powerful Rebellion against him. In England they endeavoured to perswade the Earl of *Derby* † to let up a Title to the Crown; which he honestly revealing, was poisoned soon after, according to the propheticall threatening of *Hesket* whom they had made use of to perswade him.

When these single shots failed, Father *Parsons* * gave a broad-side to the *Royal House of Scotland*. For he publisht a Book under the name of *Doleman*, wherein he set up divers Competitours for the Succession, and consequently for many Enemies to the unquestionable Right of that Family. And to provide one sure Enemy upon the place, he found out a Title for the Earl of *Essex*, the most ambitious and popular man in the Nation, to whom also he craftily dedicated his Book. In which he mentions, among other Books of this nature, one written by *Lestey* concerning the Queen of *Scots* Title; another by *Heghinton* for the King of *Spain* Title; and another concerning the Prince of *Parma's*; But for his part, before these and all others, he prefers the Title of the *Infanta*. And, to shew that he meant as he said, he caused their Scholars in the Seminaries abroad to subscribe to it, and made them swear to maintain it, and bound the Missionaries to promote it in those places whither they were to be sent. Whereas for King *James* his Title, he prefers several others before it, and tells us, *I have not found very many in England that favour it*: meaning sure of your Catholicks, with whom his converse chiefly was; and concerning whom he gives this remarkable testimony, that
the

* *Camden*.
Eliz. 1588.

† Cardinal
Allens
admonition,
W. Watson
Quodl p. 240.
and 247.

* *Camden*
Eliz. An. 1589.

Watson
Quodl. p. 150.

† *Camden* lb.
Anno 1593.

Watson lb.
p. 154.

* *Camden* lb.
Anno 1594.

Dolemans
Conference
about the
next succession
to the Crown.

Doleman part.
2. p. 9.

Camden lb.
1601.

Watson lb.
p. 279.

Doleman lb.
p. 109.

the Catholicks make little account of his Title by means of Succession. Ib. p. 110.

We have reason to believe he did not wrong them, because when an answer was written to his Book, the Arch-Priest *Blackwel* would not suffer it to be published. And your next Head-Officer, the Provincial of the Jesuites, declared he would have nothing to do with King *James* his Title: and 'twas the common voice of the men of his Order, that if King *James* would turn *Catholick*, they would follow him; but if not, they would all dye against him.

Watson, Ib. p. 107.
Tortura Torti. p. 197.
Watson, Ib. p. 150.

Which pious Resolutions were seconded with agreeable Actions. For they endeavoured, as far as Catholicks are obliged by their principles, viz. as far as they durst and were able; at first, to hinder him from coming in, and afterwards to throw him out again or to destroy him in the place, as we shall have occasion to shew you in the answer to the next Paragraph.

The mean while out of this present discourse, in which you cannot deny any thing that is material to our purpose; It appears that this *hard question of Rights to the Crown*, was not between the parties themselves in one or t'other of whom you confels the right was. It appears that your Infallible Judge of Controversies very easily and impartially resolv'd it, by denying both sides of the question, and assuming the whole right to himself. It appears that your Catholicks, who are said to have sided with one against the other, did in truth side with the Pope against them both. And lastly, it appears that their *misdeemeanors* were inexcusable Treasons, if any Treason can be inexcusable that is befriended with such an Apologist.

[*'Twas for the Royal House of Scotland that they suffered in those days; and 'tis for the same Illustrious Family we are ready to hazard all on any occasion.*]

Sir, we have found you notoriously false in that which you affirm: Pray God you prove true in that which you promise.

The Papists Apology answered

[Nor can the consequence of the former procedure be but ill, if a Henry VIII (whom Sir W. Raleigh, and my Lord Cherbury, two famous Protestants, have so homely characteriz'd) should after twenty years cohabitation turn away his Wife, and throw out of scruple of Conscience (as he said) when as History declares that he never spared Woman in his Lust, nor man in his Fury.]

*V. Yba. Hig.
l. 1.

†Philopater. p.
308. and 313.

Rt. v Yba lb.

This Character would better agree with many a Head of a Church whom we could name you, then with Henry VIII. of whom better *Historians speak better things. But if he were such a Monster as you would make him, perhaps it was for want of a better Religion, for he was perfectly of Your's, except only in the point of Supremacy. And you had no occasion for this flurt at him; unless, that having undertaken to put the best colours upon Treason, you might think you did something towards it in belpatterring of Kings.

We have a touch of the same Art in the next Paragraph, Where, having undertaken to excuse the Gun-Powder-Treason, you call it first a *Misdemeanor*, then the *Fifth of November*, and then a *Conjuration*; soft words all of them; but you deal wiked hardly with the great Minister of State, whom you make to have been the Author of it; as if the Traitors had not conspired against the State, but the State against them.

But before we come to answer this, it will be needful to set down the story, as it appears out of the Examinations and Confessions of the Traitors themselves.

The rise of this Treason, was from the before-mentioned Breves of Pope Clement VIII. in which he required all his Catholiks, that after the death of that wretched Woman Queen Elizabeth, they should admit none but a Catholick to reign over them. These Breves were by Garnet the Provincial of the Jesuites communicated to Catesby and others; who in Obedience thought best to begin their Practices in her lifetime. So they sent Father Tefmund and Winter into Spain to crave the assistance of that Crown. The Spaniard sent them back with the promise of an Army. But soon after Queen Elizabeth died, and no Army came. Therefore again

again they sent *Christopher Wright* into *Spain* to hasten it; and *Stanly* out of *Flanders* sent *Fauke* thither upon the same errand; who finding the Counsels of *Spain* at this time wholly enclined to peace, returned quickly back, and brought nothing but despair along with them.

Yet the *Breves* had so wrought upon *Catesby*, that he could not find in his heart to give over; but still casting about for ways, he hit upon this of the Powder-Treason, which as being much out of the common Rode, he thought the most secure for his purpose. He communicated this to *Winter*; who approved it, and fetcht *Fauke* out of *Flanders* to assist in it. Not long after *Piercy* being in their company, and offering himself to any service for the Catholick Cause, though it were even the Kings Death: *Catesby* told him, that that was too poor an Adventure for him: but, saith he, if thou wilt be a Traitor, there is a Plot of greater advantage, and such an one as can never be discovered. Thus having duly prepar'd him, he took him into the Conspiracy. And the like he did with so many more as made up their Number 13. of the Laity.

But where were the *Jesuites* all this while? Not idle, you may be sure. The Provincial *Garnet* was privy to it from the beginning, so were divers* more of the Society. Inso-much that when *Watson* endeavour'd to have drawn them into his Plot (for the setting up of the Lady *Arabella's* Title in opposition to King *James* his) they declin'd it, *saying, they had another of their own then afoot, and that they would not mingle designs with him for fear of hindering one another.

But *Watson* miscarried with his Plot, and the *Jesuites* went on with theirs. They absolv'd the Conspirators of the guilt, and extenuated the danger of their Design; they perswaded them how highly beneficial it would be in the Consequences of it; they gave them their Oath, by the Holy Trinity and the Sacrament which they did then receive, that none of them should reveal it to any other, or with-draw himself from it without common consent: and for the pitifal scruple of destroying the Innocent with the Guilty, *Garnet* answered, they might lawfully do it in order

* *Baldwin*,
Hammond,
Tefmund, and
Gerrard were
named by the
Conspirators,
as privy with
them.
* *V. Watsons*
Confession.

The Papists Apology answered

to a greater good. Yet it seems there was a spark of Humanity in some of them, which the Divinity of this Casuist had not quite extinguish't; as appear'd, either by the absenting of some Lords that were afterward fined for it in the Star-Chamber, or certainly by that Letter of warning to my Lord *Monteagle*, which was the happy occasion of the Discovery of the whole Treason.

In *Warwickshire*, where the Princess *Elizabeth* then was, they had appointed a meeting, under the pretence of a Hunting-Match, to seize upon her, the same day in which the King and his Male Issue were to have been destroyed. There met about fourscore of them, which was a number sufficient for that business. But the news of the Discovery coming among them, they were so dismayed at it, that they desisted from their enterprize, and fled into *Staffordshire*; where, the Countrey being raised against them, they were some of them kill'd, and the rest taken; and those which were alive of the prime Conspirators were sent up to *London*, and there Executed.

This is the plain story, now let us see how you colour it.

[Now for the Fifth of November, with hands lifted up to Heaven, we abominate and detest,]

What is it that you *abominate and detest*? That day which is the Festival of our Deliverance? We can believe you without *your hands lifted up to Heaven*. Or mean you the Treason which was to have been acted upon that day? Why then do you not speak out and call it so? For if you cannot afford to call it Treason, it is not the *lifting up of your hands* that can make us believe you do heartily *abominate and detest* it.

[And from the bottom of our hearts say, that may they fall into irrecoverable Perdition, who propagate the Faith by the Blood of Kings, which is to be planted in truth and meekness only.]

It was a good caution of a Philosopher to the Son of a Com-

common Woman, that he should not throw Stones among a multitude, for fear of hitting his Father. You might have had that caution when you threw out this curse; for your Father the Pope stands fairest for it of all men that we know in the world.

[But let it not displease you, Men, Brethren, and Fathers, if we ask whether Ulysses be no better known? or who hath forged the Plot of Cromwel framed in his Closet; not only to destroy many faithful Cavaliers, but also to put a lustre upon his Intelligence, as if nothing could be done without his knowledge. Even so did the then great Minister, who drew some few Desperado's into this conjuration, and then discovered it by a Miracle.]

Having spit and wip't your mouth, now you make your speech. And it begins with a mixture of *Apostle* and *Poet*; to shew what we are to expect from you; namely, with much Gravity, much Fiction: and so far you do not go about to deceive us.

The scope of your speech is to make the world believe that your Catholicicks were drawn into this Plot by Secretary Cecil. You are so wise, that you do not offer to prove this; but you would steal it into us by an example, that we are concerned in. As Cromwel trepann'd many faithful Cavaliers, even so Cecil drew in some few Desperado's. Comparisons (they say) are odious: but to the business.

First, admitting your Fiction, as if it were true, that Cecil did draw in those wretches into this Treason. Was is ever the less Treason because he drew them into it? For, according to your own supposition, they did not know that they were drawn in by him. But they verily thought that they had followed their own Guides; and they zealously did according to their own Principles. They did, what they would have done, if there had been no Cecil in the world; provided there had been a Devil in his roon, to have put it into their heads. For your excuse only implies, that they had not the wit to invent it: But their progress in it shews, that they wanted not the malice to have executed it. So that according to your own illustration: As those faithful Ca-

E

valiers

The Papists Apology answered

valiers whom *Cromwell* drew in, had their Loyalty abused, and were never the less Faithful still; so those Powder-Traitors whom you say *Cecil* drew in, had their Disloyalty outwitted, and were nevertheless Traitors still. For as well in the one case as in the other, this very thing that they could be drawn in, is a clear demonstration that they were before-hand sufficiently disposed for it.

Secondly, when you have considered the absurdity of your excuse for your Friends, you may do well to think of an excuse for your self. For that which you affirm of *Cecil's* having drawn them into this Plot, is a very groundless and impudent Fiction, and you are properly the Author of it. For though others perhaps may have spoken this in rail-lery; yet you are the first, that we know of, that has asserted it in print.

*P. His
Speech in
Parliament.
1605. and his
Relation, &c.
Warrington.
p. 7. saith,
None were
therein
culpable, but
only Jesuites
and Catholics.

Casaub. Epist.
ad Front.
Ducum.

Pray Sir, whence had you this tale? By what Tradition did you receive it? Or had you some new Revelation of the Causes threescore years after the Fact? For 'tis plain, that King *James* * knew nothing of it. *Belarmin* and his fellow *Apologists* in that Age never pretended it. The parties themselves, neither at their Tryal, nor at their Execution, gave any intimation of it. Can you tell us which of the Conspirators were *Cecil's* Instruments to draw in the rest? Or can you think he was so great an Artist, that he could persuade his Setters to be hang'd, that his Art might not be suspected? For 'tis well known that he sav'd not any of those wretches from suffering. And they which did suffer, charged none other, but themselves, in their Confessions. Particularly, *Father Garnet* said, before Doctor *Overal* and divers others, that *he would give all the world, if it were his, to clear his Conscience or his Name from that Treason.*

These are strong presumptions of the Negative; but you ought to have proved your Affirmative, or at least to have offered something toward it. For if barely to say this, be enough, then here is an excuse indifferently calculated for all Treasons in the world that miscarry: (and if they prosper, who dares call them Treason?) Here is a never-failing Topick for any one that would write an *Apology* in behalf of
any

any Villany whatsoever. For if the Traitors be discover'd by any kinde of accident, this will always remain to be said for them, that *the then great Ministers drew them in.*

But why did you not say this for those Conspiracies in Queen *Elizabeth's* days? you might have said it perhaps with less improbability. But then you had a higher Game to fly at, namely the *Queens* Title to her Crown; and if you Durst have made so bold with King *James* his, you would not have stoop'd to so low a Quarry as a Minister of State.

By the way, we cannot but acknowledge, that you Jesuites are a sort of most Obliging Gentlemen. If men will believe what you Say, nothing that you do can fall amiss. In your attempts against the life of Queen *Elizabeth*, you oblig'd his Majesty that now is, as being Martyrs for the *Royal House of Scotland*. And in your Plot to blow up that Royal House, you were a kinde of Fellow-sufferers with *the faithful Cavaliers*; for as they us'd to be trepan'd by *Cromwel*, even so you were drawn in by Secretary *Cecil*.

It is worth observing in this Paragraph, how you diminish that hellish Plot, by calling them that were engag'd in it a *few Desperado's*.

The *Fewness* of them will be considered in your next.

But in what sense do you call them *Desperado's*? Were they such in respect of their Fortunes? That is to well known to be false, that it needs no Answer. Were they such in respect of their Discontents? that seems to be your meaning. But there was little reason for any. For at the time of this Conspiracy, there was none of your Priests in Prison, there was no Mulet taken of any Lay-man, *Nor was there a man of them*, as King *James* * said, *that could alledge any pretended cause of grief.* And yet they were continually restless, as we have shewn you in their story. Was it because they had not all the liberty they would have had? This is so far from excusing Them, that it rather gives us occasion of suspecting You.

*King *James*
Speech in
Parliament,
1607.

'Tis no wonder that you, who cannot afford to call this Conspiracy a Treason, are not willing to allow the *Discovery* of it a *Miracle*. Yet You might have forborn *Scot-*

* 1b.

* Tortur, p. 65.
Edit. Colon.

* Sixti Orat.

sing at it, in respect to King * James who was pleas'd to Name it so. Especially when his Adversary *Bellarmin* * acknowledges that it was *not without a Miracle of Divine Providence*. And sure our King makes a better use of this word *Miracle* in the thankful acknowledgement of Gods great Mercy in his deliverance; than your Pope * *Sixtus V.* did in his insolent Oration upon the King of *France's* Murder; by which we may guess what Some body would have called this Plot if it had Sped.

[This will easily appear, viz. how little the Catholick Party understood the Design, seeing there was not a score of Guilty found, though all imaginable industry was used by the Commons, Lords, and Privy Council too]

* 5 Jesuites,
13 Lay-men,
besides *Owen*
and *Stanley*.

* At *La*
Fleche, and
elsewhere.

The Design it self was understood but by Few, because it was neither safe nor needful to impart it to Many. But the *Papists* generally knew that there was a Design in hand; and though they did not know the horrid nature of it, yet many of them pray'd for the success of it: and if the Plot had taken effect, and the Hunting-Match had gone on, we should then have been better able to have judg'd how your *Catholick Party* stood affected toward it. Sure enough though there were but a * Score in the Treason, yet there appear'd Four-score in the Rebellion: and it cannot be imagin'd, that so small a Number could expect, without any other Assistance, to have made any great Advantage by surprizing the Lady *Elizabeth*. But when the Treason had miscarried, as hateful as it was (for who does not hate Treason when it is unsuccessful?) yet many of you had a high Veneration for some of those Wretches that were deeply engaged in it. What a Coil here was about the Miracle of *Father Garnet's* straw? and perhaps you have seen his Picture, and *Gerard's* too among the * Martyrs of your Society. Nay his Holiness himself shew'd his good Will to them, when after all this, he made *Tesmond* Penitentiary at *St. Peters* in *Rome*.

But

[But suppose, my Lords and Gentlemen, (which never can be granted) that all the Papists of that Age were consenting, will you be so severe then, as still punish the Children for the Fathers Faults?]

[Nay such Children that so unanimously joynd with you in that glorious Quarrel, when you and we underwent such sufferings, that needs we must have all sunk, had not our mutual love assisted.]

You suppose that which is False, to avoid that which is True. For who ever said, that *All the P-pists of that Age were Consenting* to the Gun-Powder Treason? or who can deny that some Papists in this Age retain the Principles of them that were Consenting to it? Who, although they are not to be *Punisht*, for what their Predecessors did: yet they ought to be so Restrained, that they may not do like their Predecessors.

And though, by that long word *Unanimously*, you endeavour to shuffle in the men of these Principles, amongst them that served his Majesty in that glorious Quarrel: Yet we think it no hard matter to distinguish them. For those among you which did the King Service, are not so many but that they may be Numbered. And as for the rest of you, which only *suffer'd* with us: we thanke you for your *Love*, but not for your *Assistance*. For we could not well have *sunk* lower than we did. But some of you floated the while like Cork; and others of you swum upon the Bladders of Dispensations. So that as we received no help from you in your Swimming; so we can apprehend no Assurance of you by your *Sufferings*.

[What have we done that we should now deserve your Anger? has the Indiscretion of some few incensed you? 'tis true, that is the thing objected.]

Sir, our *Anger* is only a Necessary Care, that what you now call your *Indiscretions*, may not grow up to be such as you lately call'd your *Misdemeanors*.

[Do not you know an Enemy may easily mistake a Mass-Bell for that which calls to Dinner?]

We

The Papists Apology answered

We know he may upon a Fast-day; For then you use to ring your Vesper Bell before Dinner. And how can a simple Heretick tell; whether it calls you, to Pray, or to eat Fish. But we do not know that ever any of you was brought in trouble about this Question.

[Or a Sequestrator be glad to be affronted being Constable? When 'twas the barred to his person and his present Office, which perchance egg'd a rash man to folly.]

Possibly he May be glad of it. For it was your Jesuitical distinction between Person and Office, that first help him to be a *Sequestrator*. And now he sees that Distinction come in play; he may hope, within a while, to have his Place again.

[We dare with submission say, Let a publick invitation be put up against any Party whatsoever: nay, against the Reverend Bishops themselves, and some malicious informer or other will alledge that, which may be far better so conceal.]

[Yet all mankind by a Manifesto on the house door are encouraged to accuse us: nor are they upon Oath, though your Enemies and ours take all for granted and true.]

What an Ambush you have laid here for the Bishops! to have them thought Popish, because You Reverence them; and Obnoxious, in such matters, as (you say) it may be far better to conceal. But as in the one, your Kindness to them is sufficiently understood; so they are able to defie your Malice, in the other. 'Tis for a Bishop of *Donna Olympia's* to need concealment. Our Bishops in England are of another make, then to hold their Credit at any one's Courtessie.

For the Manifesto that troubled you, what could the Parliament do less, when the Complaints of you were great in all parts of the Nation, than to Invite men to bring their grievances to the proper place of Redress? But then, say you, men were not upon Oath, for what they said against you. What a Hardship was this? that the House of Commons would

*V. Her
Life. p. 61.
and p. 156,
157.

would not do that for Your sakes, which no *House of Commons* ever did upon Any occasion.

[*It cannot be imagined where there's so many men of heat and youth (over joyed with the happy restoration of their Prince) and remembering the insolencies of their Grandees, that they should all at all times prudently carry themselves; for this would be to be more than men. And truly, we esteem it as a particular blessing, that God hath not suffered many, through vanity or frailty to fall into greater faults, than are yet as we understand laid to our charge.*]

The King will never be out of your debt, if a Jesuite may but keep the reckoning. Your old Treasons you put upon the account of his Family and Friends, and your late Insolencies upon the Score of his most *Happy Restoration*. But would you seriously persuade us, that, at six years distance, *so many men of heat and youth* were still transported with the Joy of that Blessing? That there were some fresher causes of this Jollity, has been vehemently suspected by many, who considered the great Unseasonableness of it, in so calamitous a time, while the Fire was raging in our Metropolis, and two such potent Enemies lay hovering upon our Coasts.

[*Can we chuse but be dismay'd (when all things fail) that extravagant Crimes are sated on us.*

It is we must be the Authors (some say) of firing the City, even we that have lost so vastly by it: yet in this, our Ingenuity is great, since we think it no Plot, though our Enemy an Hugonot Protestant acknowledged the Fact, and was justly Executed for his vain Confession. Again, if a Merchants of the Church of England buy Knives for the business of his Trade; This also is a Papiſt Contrivance, to destroy the well affected.]

There can be nothing charged on you, more *extravagant* than those things were, which your Predecessors committed, and which here You have taken upon you to justify or excuse. The Particulars of your Charge, whatsoever they are, we leave to the consideration of the Parliament; where we heartily wish there may appear more Reason on your side, than there is to be found in this *Apology*. For, as to the *Firing of the City*, if, according to your words (which

we

Garnet in the
case of the
Powder-
Plot,

we have not hitherto found to be Gospel) *you have lost so vastly by it*; yet that will not Acquit you from the suspicion of the Fact, in the judgment of any one that considers the Determination of your late *Provincial*, * *viz.* that it is lawful to destroy the Innocent with the Guilty in order to a greater good. And it seems this *vast loss* goes not near your Heart; one would think so by your pleasantness in the very next passage. For there you call *Hub* *rt* your *Enemy*, and a *Hug* *not* *Protestant*: which *Habers*, after Father Hurvy had had him at Confession, did indeed assure himself to be a *Protestant*; but then being asked whether he meant a *Hugonot* (which it seems was beyond his Instructions to say) he earnestly denied that, as he very well might, for he then also declar'd that he believed Confession to a Priest was necessary to his salvation; and being admonish'd to call upon God, he repeated an *Ave Mary*, which he said was his usual Prayer. So that it evidently appears, he was neither *Hugonot*, nor *Protestant*, nor Your *Enemy* upon any account of Religion. And yet you, being about to avouch this knot of Falshoods, are pleas'd to usher them in with this Preface, (either in Praise of your Brother *Hovvy's* pious Fraud, or of your own Proper Virtue) *Truly in this our ingenuity is great.*

[*We must a little complain, finding it by experience, that by reason you discounterance us, the People rage: and again, because they rage we are the more forsaken by you.*]

[*Assured we are, that our Conversation is affable, and our Houses so many Hospitable receipts to our Neighbours. Our acquaintance therefore we fear at no time; but it is the stranger we dread: that (taking all on bear-say) zealously wounds, and then examines the business when it is too late, or is per chance confirmed by another, that knows no more of us than he himself.*]

[*'Tis to you we must make our Applications, beseeching you (as Subjects tender of our King) to intercede for us in the execution, and weigh the Dilemma, which doubtless he is in, either to deny so good a Parliament their requests, or else run counter to his Royal Inclinations, when he punishes the weak and harmless.*]

He that complains without cause, must be heard without redress.

We

We only desire to be Safe from those dangers, to which your Principles would expose us, and against which neither *Affablents* nor *Hospitality* will secure us. The Protestants of Ireland were never so treated and caressed by their Popish Neighbors, as they were the very year before they cut their throats.

The best Means of our security, is, that which his Majesty has been pleased to require, *viz.* the discreet execution of his Laws. By which (if others shall please to distinguish themselves from the rest by renouncing their disloyal Principles) only the disloyal and seditious will be kept *weak*, that they may be *harmless*.

[*Why may we not noble Countrey-men, hope for favour from you, as well as French Protestants finde from theirs? a greater duty than ours none could express, we are sure; or why should the united Provinces, and other Magistrats (that are harsh both in minds and manners) refrain from violence against our Religion, and your tender breasts seem not to harbour the least compassion or pity?*]

[*These barbarous people Sequester none for their Faith, but for Transgression against the State. Nor is the whole Party involved in the Crime of a few but every man suffers for his own and proper Fault? Do you then the like, and be that offends let him dye without mercy.*]

[*And think alwayes, I beseech you of Cromwel's Injustice; who for the Actions of some against his pretended Laws, drew thousands into decimation, even ignorant of the thing, after they had vastly paid for their security and quiet.*]

We have answer'd your Instances, of the *French Protestants*, and the *Dutch Papists*; and your unjust Upbraiding us, with the *greatness of your duty*, and with our *want of compassion and pity*. And yet, as if all these were unanswerable, you come over with them again and again.

These barbarous people, you say, *sequester none for their Faith*; but pray what did you, when you govern'd the *Civiliz'd World*? you hang'd and burn'd men, for no other cause but their Faith; And this you did with abundance of *Civility*; so it seems, we may be worse than *Barbarous*, and yet much better than you.

The Papists Apology answered

But that were little for our credit, unless we had this to say more; that not the worst of you *suffers* any otherwise than by known Laws, or any more than is of pure Necessity. For, we hold it Necessary to maintain the Authority of the King, and the Peace of the Nation. If you call any thing *Religion*, that is contrary to these; must we therefore alter our Laws? or ought you to mend your Religion?

You put the Effigies of *Cromwel* upon any thing that you would render odious; as your Inquisition bedresses one with Pictures of Devils, whom they are about to burn for his Religion. For such Disguizes are apt to work much upon the weak judgments of the multitude. But he must be very weak indeed that cannot perceive the wide Difference, between the Edicts of *Cromwel*, that were design'd to Ruine men for their Loyalty, and Those Laws that our Princes have made to Restrain them from Treason and Rebellion.

[*We have no other study, but the glory of our Sovereign and just liberty of the Subjects.*]

Sir, if we may judge by your Works, there is *nothing* less studied in your Colledge.

[*Nor was it a mean argument of our Duty, when every Catholick Lord gave his voice for the Restauration of Bishops; by which we could pretend no other advantage, but that 26 Forces (subsisting wholly by the Crown) were added to the defence of Kingdome, and consequently a check to all Anarchy and Confusion.*]

This is no *Argument* of your *Duty*, for, sure, you are no *Lord*. Nor is it likely that these Lords follow'd your direction in the doing of this *Duty*.

[*'Tis morally impossible that we who approve of Monarchy in the Church must ever be fond of it in the State also.*]

If you mean this of Papists in General, that which you call *morally impossible* is Experimentally True. For in *Venice*, *Genova*, *Lucca*, and the Popish Cantons of *Switzerland*, where they

in behalf of the Royallists.

41

they very well approve of *Monarchy in the Church*; yet they are not fond of it in the *State also*. But if you mean this of the Jesuitical Party, then it may be true in this sense, that you would have the Pope to be sole Monarch both in Spirituals and Temporals,

[*Yes this is a misfortune, we now plainly feel, that the longer the late Transgressors live, the more forgotten are the Crimes, whilst distance in time Calls the faults of our Fathers to remembrance, and buries our own Allegiance in eternal oblivion and forgetfulness.*]

We can now allow you to complain, and commend your selves without measure; having prov'd already, that you do it without cause.

[*My Lords and Gentlemen, consider we beseech you the sad condition of the Irish Souldiers now in England; the worst of which Nation could be but intentionally so wicked, as the old villany of many English, whom your admired Clemency pardoned. Remember how they left the Spanish Service when they heard their King was in France; and how they forsooke the Employments of that unnatural Prince, after he had committed the never to be forgotten Act of banishing his distressed Kinsman out of his Dominions. Those poor men left all again to bring their Monarch to his home: and shall they then be forgotten by you? or shall my Lord Douglas and his brave Scots be left to their shifts, who scorned to receive wages of those who had declared War against England?*]

To swell up the Bill of the Merits of your Party, you take in the Service of the *Irish* and *Scottish Souldiers*, as if they were a part of the *English Catholicks*, whom you profess to plead for in the Title of your *Apology*. And that you may seem to have done this, in kindness to them, and not to your selves; you exhort us to *Consider* them, in such terms, as if you were the first that had ever thought of them. God forbid but they should be consider'd as they deserve; and he is neither good Christian, nor good Subject, that would grudge to contribute his proportion to it.

But you seem to have a farther drift in the mentioning of these *Loyal Irish*. For you immediately mingle them with the *worst of that Nation*; namely with those infamous Butchers, that in times of as great Peace and Liberty as ever

The Papists Apology answered

*Lord Orery's
Answer to
Welsh p. 10.
saith, within
few months
about two
hundred
thousand.

that Nation enjoyed, and in the Name of the gracious King under whom they enjoyed these, cut the throats of above an hundred thousand of his Protestant Subjects of all Sexes and Ages. It was so black a villany, that you, the Apologist of such Actions, knew not how to mention it in its proper place, viz. after the French Massacre, because you had not wherewith to colour it. And yet being conscious to your self that this lay as a blot upon your Cause, you thought fit to place it among these brave Men; as if their Names would mend the hue of an Action that will make the Names of all that had to do in it look black and detestable to mankind throughout all Generations.

Nor do you deal much better with our Royallists themselves; of whom you do not stick to affirm, that in their *admir'd Clemency*, (and if this were true, who would not *admire* it?) they pardon'd *Many English*, whose *Alled Villanies* were so wicked, that the *worst of the Irish Nation could be but Intentionally so wicked* in their Villanies.

[How commonly is it said that the Oath of Renouncing their Religion is intended for these, which will needs bring this loss to the King and ion, that either you will force all of our Faith to lay down their Arms (though by experience of great Integrity and Worth) or else, if some few you retain, they are such whom necessity hath made to swear against Conscience, and who therefore will certainly betray you, when a greater advantage shall be offered. By this Test then you can have none, but whom (with Caution) you ought to shun. And thus must you drive away those who truly would serve you; for had they the least thought of being false, they would gladly take the advantage of gain and pay to deceive you.]

You proceed, concerning the *Irish and Scottish Soldiers*, in these words; *How commonly is it said, that the Oath of Renouncing their Religion is intended for them!* Pray Sir, can you tell who are said to intend this? For if they are such as have no Authority, it is frivolous. If they are such as have Authority, it is false. And we do verily believe it was never said, withit, or thought of, by any one that lov'd the King, and the peace of the Nation.

But what trick had this Jesuite in his head when he fram'd this? One may guess at his design; But let it pass. Perhaps

in behalf of the Royallists.

43

haps he only imagined this, to heighten his Fancy, that he might think and write the more Tragically toward the end of his Oration.

[We know your Wisdom and Generosity, and therefore cannot imagine such a thing; nor do we doubt when you show favor unto these, but you will use mercy to us, who are but fellow subjects. and your own flesh and blood also: if you forsake us we must say the world decays, and its final transmutation must needs follow.]

Here you un-imagin for the Souldiers, and imagin for your self: and, as if you really thought your self in danger, you beg for *mercy* of the Royallists, in such words as your Predecessor us'd to the Rebels. * Only for the last strain, we do not know that any one hit upon it before, nor do believe that any one will ever use it again.

[Little do you think the insolencies we shall suffer by Committee-men, &c. whom chance and lot, hath but into petty power. Nor will it chuse but grieve you to see them abused (whom formerly you loved) even by the common enemies of us both.]

It seems *Committee-men* are entrusted with his Majesties Authority; or that none must use it against Papists for fear of being accounted *Committee-men*.

It is time to have done, when we are come to the dregs of your Rhetorick.

[When they punish, how will they triumph and say, take This (poor Romanists) for your love to Kingship; and again This, for your long doting on the Royal Party: all which you shall receive from us Commissioned by your dearest Friends; and under this Cloak we will ghastly wane our private spleen and malice.]

Sir, though you set your self before to speak Tragically, this does rather seem a piece of Dullery. But you Have your design either way. For no man can read it, but he must either Laugh, or Shake his head.

[We know my Lords and Gentlemen, that from your hearts you do deplore our condition; yet permit us to tell you your bravery must extend thus far, as not to sit still, with pity only, but each is to labour, for the distressed as far as

* First Moderator, p. 76.
Your own Kindred and Allies, your own Countryman, born to the same freedom with your selves: who have in Much less measure (then the Scots) Offended in matters of Hostility, may divers of them not at all.

The Papists Apology answered

in reality his ability will reach: Some must beseech our Gracious Sovereign for us, others again must undceive the good, though deluded multitude: therefore all are to remember who are the prime raisers of the storm; and how through our sides they would wound both the King and you: for though their hatred to us our selves is great, yet the enmity out of all measure increases, because we have been yours, and so shall continue even in the fiery day of tryal.

Protest us we beseech you then upon all your former promises, or if that be not sufficient, for the sakes of those that lost their Estates with you, many of which are now fallen asleep: But if this be still too weak, we must conjure you by the sight of this bloody Catalogue, which contains the names of your murdered Friends and Relations, who in the heat of the Battle perchance saved many of your lives, even with the joyful loss of their own.]

Sir, In answer to this Paragraph, you Oblige us to speak plainer, what before we only intimated to you.

It was the Policy of the Rebels in the beginning of the late War, to harrass the Papists in all parts of the Kingdom, One Reason of it was, to make his Majesty Odious; for the Papist being his Subjects, and having none but him to fly to, it was certain he would do what he could to Protect them, and this would make many zealous people believe that what the Rebels pretended was true, *viz.* that his Majesty was a Friend to Popery. Another Reason was to enrich themselves with their Spoils, and to invite the Needy Rabble with a prospect of Booty; among which, if they found a String of Beads, or a Crucifix, it serv'd them upon both Accounts, both to fill their Pockets, and to justify the Cause.

By this Means you were driven into his Majesties Garrisons, where, besides those that voluntarily offer'd themselves to his Service, many of you were Necessitated to it for a subsistence, and many more of you did not serve him at all, but on'y shrowded your selves under his Protection. Whereas the Protestant Royallists had no such Necessity, for they might have been Welcome to the Rebels, to do as They did; or they might have been Permitted to live quietly at their home. But they chose to do otherwise, and were hated the more for it by the Rebels, because they prefer'd their duty before those Considerations.

From

* Second Moderator, p. 43. Most of them in the beginning of the late War (seeing themselves unprotected by the Parliament and exposed to the plunder of the then Souldiers) fled into the King's Garrisons, to save their own lives, without taking up Arms to offend others.

From this Account of the Motives that brought us together, it is easie to Judge how far we are in debt to one another.

First, As for them which *lost their Estates* with us, We remember those things were alledged in their defence, * which we would have been loth to have admitted in ours. But possibly it was not their Fault that these things were Alledg'd, nor was it to our Advantage that they were not Accepted. For the Rebels, having devour'd these Gentlemens Estates, fell to ours, with the more Colour, and with never the less Appetite.

*Second Moderator, P. 43.

In your Catalogue of those Papists which were Slain in the Service, you have Omitted some names which we are able to Reckon. But perhaps you did this in design, that you might the more excusably Reckon some names that you ought to have Omitted. So you begin with my Lord of *Carnarvon*, the only Nobleman in your Catalogue, who was indeed too Negligent of his Religion, till he came to be in view of Death; But then, in his extremities, he Refus'd a Priest of yours, and Ordered the Chaplain * of his Regiment to pray with him. If you take this liberty of stealing Martyrs, we have Reason to wonder, that you had not taken in, one that would have Adorn'd your Cause indeed, *viz.* his Majesty himself; since *Milistire* was not a sham'd to publish, that that Blessed and Glorious Prince died of your Religion. Him alone we might weigh against All that ever was good in your Church. But besides, we could reckon you a far greater number of Protestants, than you pretend to do of Papists, that *lost their Lives* also *in the Day of Battle*. They lost them joyfully, in hopes to have sav'd his Majesty's Life; and 'twas an Accession to their Joy, *if perchance they sav'd any of yours.*

*Mr. Langford

*In his Victory of Truth.

But did they ever intend their sufferings should go for nothing, or become Ciphers to yours in the day of Reckoning? or that their blood should be made use of to stop the Execution of those Laws for which they shed it? Did they think your *condition* was so *deplorable*, or their own was superfluously fenced and secured against you before the late troubles?

Pray

Pray Sir do not perswade us to believe a thing to incredible, or to do at the rate as if we did believe it. Rather, if you have such an opinion of your own Faculty, Try what you can do with your own Party, and perswade them to do what is fittest and best for Themselves.

But because the Genius of your Writing does not give us any such Hopes of You: We shall rather make bold to say something from our selves, by way of Advice, to as many of them as may happen to need it, or are capable to receive it.

We desire them to Content themselves with that condition which they enjoy'd under his Majesties Royal Predecessors; and neither to Disparage those dayes, by endeavouring to perswade the world that they which suffered then for Treason died for Religion; Nor to undervalue all the Liberties which they now Enjoy, if they may not be allow'd to Exceed the Measures of their Fathers. We wish they would not, for the paring of their nails, make all Christendom ring with cries of Persecution. We wish them deeply to lay to Heart, the Honor, and Peace, and Welfare of their Nation. To abhor him, that could wish to see it in Trouble, in hope that at next Turn it would settle in Popery; or that could find in his heart to bid a Forreigner welcome upon the terms of restoring Catholick Religion. We desire them to keep their Religion to themselves: and not lay about them, as some do, to make Profelytes; of which they have had a plentiful harvest in the late Confusions; and if they should think to go on at that rate, we have reason to fear it would be a means to bring us into Confusion again. We desire them at least not to abuse the weakness of dying persons: nor under pretence of carrying Alms to condemned Prisoners, to Convert some of them with drink, and to cheat others with hopes of Salvation upon easier terms than ever God yet declar'd unto Man. We desire them not to hinder the course of Justice by interposing in the behalf of any Criminal, because he is a Catholick. We desire them to content themselves, as their Fathers have done, with such Priests as are known and protected by the Civil Power; and that They would be pleas'd to demean themselves as Priests ought to do: not disguising themselves like Hectors, or mingling with Gentlemen, to poyson the Clubs and Coffee-Houses with Phanatick Discourses, or even with Atheism it self, to destroy all Religion that they may have their will upon ours. We desire them not to fill the World with their Pamphlets, *Parallels*, *Phylanaxes*, *Exhortations*, *Apologies*, &c. which tend only to the somenting of Mens Passions, not at all to the conviction of their Reason. If they please to come into the fair Field of Controversie, we shall not decline them; and we think we are not in Debt to them upon that Account. But for Books of the other sort which are apt only to inflame Parties, and make the people Jealous, and the Government Uneasie, We wish they would spare their Own pains, and consequently Ours. If they will not, let them bear their own blame, and let them Answer it to the world what occasion they had to give us this trouble of Answering them.

FINIS.

D. of Medina
in 88. said, his
Sword knew
no distinction
between
Catholick
and Here-
tick.

*F. Cambrden's
Eliz. 1622.

Considerations

Touching the True way to suppress

P O P E R Y

IN THIS

K I N G D O M :

By making a Distinction between Men of
LOYAL and *DISLOYAL*

P R I N C I P L E S

In that *COMMUNION*.

On occasion whereof is inserted an

Historical Account

OF THE

R E F O R M A T I O N

Here in *E N G L A N D*.

L O N D O N :

Printed for *Henry Brome* in *St. Paul's Church-yard*,
at the West end. 1677.

70:03

A

PREFACE.

THE Reader will find this Book to be of a mixt nature, and in some places of a different stile ; as being compos'd at distant times, and by two several hands. One part of it is a Proposition for securing the Civil State against the danger of Popery, by making a distinction between them of the Roman Communion. The other part, which is inserted into the former, concerns the chief and original controversies between ours and the Roman Church.

For that Part which belongs to the Civil State, it was most of it printed about a year since, as appears by several Instances *, of which the Reader is desired to take notice, that there may be no mistake in the timeing of some things.

A 2

The

* P. 44. these ten years.

P. 50. March was twelve month.

P. 66 M. L. case's case.

A Preface.

The Model of this Part was drawn up by a worthy Gentleman, who thought it a design, not only agreeable to his known Moderation, but really Practicable; and likely to be exceedingly beneficial toward the safety of this Kingdom at home, and the honour of it abroad; to which nothing would more conduce, and yet nothing is more wanting, than some kind of general unity of the English Nation within it self.

But what is here said on this Argument, the Reader is intreated to interpret with the same candor with which it was intended. For the things proposed being only spoken Problematically, it cannot be expected they should be deliver'd with great exactness; and it is but reason that every little expression should not be called to a severe Account, in a Treatise, where the whole design it self is not imposed, but only offer'd to be fairly consider'd.

If any one think that even this is a boldness, which private men should not allow themselves, in matters which belong to the Government, the Author could wish all men were of that mind, though it put him to the cost of an Apology for
himself

A Preface.

himself in this particular. But he is not so ignorant of the Age we live in, as not to know that this Liberty is commonly taken; and that none is censured for it, that does not much exceed the bounds of Modesty. And if others can extend this Liberty so far, as to write Books that tend directly to disturb the publick settlement; he does not see what need he can have for an excuse for writing that which can have no other end but to promote it. To speak plain, he has seen divers pieces of late, whereof some go about from hand to hand, to dissuade men from taking the Oath of Allegiance; others, and those not a few of late years, have been printed and sold publicly in behalf of a General Toleration. What is, if this be not, to assault the publick settlement? and either to force our Governors to alter it, or to set the people against them for continuing it? Not to mention the Reproaches that are thrown upon the Memory of them by whom the settlement was made. Whereas, here, is no design to alter any thing of it, any farther than may be needful to make it the more practicable in our times. To a people that is always prone to Compassion, and of late so much discomposed by a Civil War, no doubt the extreme severity

A Preface.

of Laws is likely to hinder the Practicableness of them. And it is not the Severity of Laws, but the Practice, that tends to the Security of the State. And therefore the Alteration here proposed is so far from having any Reflection on the Wisdom of our Legislators in former times, that there is no reason to doubt that they would have made it themselves if they had lived in our present Circumstances. If the Author commit any error in judging thus; he is not obstinate in it, but submits this together with the rest to the Judgment of wise and good men; and especially to the Publick Wisdom, which must be Acknowledg'd to be the most proper, and it were well if it were the only Judg in these matters.

*Chiefly from
p. 4. till the
Conclusion.*

The other things^b contained in this Book were added by another Person; who, being well persuaded of the usefulness of the foregoing design, was desirous to improve it to farther Advantage. And therefore he thought it would be an useful Labour, and prudent Counsel; not only to render the Civil State easie to the peaceable Romanists among us, but to make them also well disposed to our Church, as well as State. He is of opinion, that, if many of their Nobility and Gentry,

A Preface.

Gentry, and some of their moderate Clergy, shall once come to live amicably with us, on the terms here mentioned, or on any other that shall be thought more discreet and seasonable; they would by degrees suffer themselves to be calmly instructed in the Justice of our Cause, and they would without Prejudice examine which side is to be blam'd for the Divisions between us. And then he doubts not but many of them would in time discover how much they have been misinformed concerning the State of our Differences.

To this purpose, hoping to find the most Ingenuous of their Laity, and even some of their well-meaning Priests, in good humour, while they are reading a Book which pleads something in their favour; he has taken this opportunity to give them some light into the occasion and progress of the first breach between us and them. This he knows to be a Subject, in which the Generality of their Laity and Clergy are most confident, and seem most to triumph. But they are much mistaken in matter of Fact; as here the Reader will see it evidently prov'd, out of Unquestionable Records, and Impartial Writers,

A Preface.

ters, many even of their own side. From whence it will appear that the whole business of the Schism was begun and continued on the Popes side for their Secular Interests and Passions; whilst the Reformation, on the part of our Church and State, was managed all along with great Justice and prudent Moderation.

After all that has been said, it is more than possible, that of one sort of men, there may be some (I hope not the wisest among them) who upon other Accounts may take offence at both Parts of this Book.

In the Political part, perhaps offence may be taken at the Liberty of this Proposal; as seeming too favourable to them of the Roman Communion, without the like Consideration for any other Dissenters. But the favour here proposed in behalf of the Romanists, is not more than they enjoy among Protestants abroad at this day: nor so much as the Generality of those who are most zealous against them have thought fit heretofore to allow to persons differing only in opinion. They did not think it fit that even Heretics themselves should suffer any Capital Punishment, barely upon
Ac.

A Preface.

Account of their Opinions, how dangerous soever they might be to mens Souls. Some, even of themselves, have written of late that no punishment should be inflicted on men for opinions that are not dangerous to the State. They who are of this mind have no reason to take offence at this Book, because the favour desired in it is for Persons as Innocent in that Respect as themselves. And for them that think Errors are punishable by the State, on Account of the hurt that they do to mens Souls; they will not find so great occasion of Offence as they may possibly expect. For the Author does not plead for any other Exemption of Roman-Catbolick, than such as will leave them still liable to as much severity, as themselves, if they are obnoxious to the Laws, can think fit to be inflicted on men barely for Differences in Opinion. Here is nothing proposed for their Exemption from any Incapacitating Laws, or from the Penalties against saying Mass publicly, or against their endeavouring to make Profelytes; which last thing is Death to Roman-Catholicks, and not at all penal to any other. These things being considered together, their Condition will not be to be envied by any

B

other

A Preface.

other Dissenters, if they should have all the favour that is propounded for them in this Book. But the Common Protestant Religion will be better secured by it, which ought to satisfie any one that pretends to that Name.

For that Part which concerns the Controversies, it is suggested by another, (which otherwise the Author could scarce have expected,) that some may think him too favourable to the Romish Opinions, or too much unconcerned for the Defence of other Protestant Churches. He does not see how any one, that minds what he reads, can suspect him of favour to the Principles of the Roman Communion; having given sufficient reason, why he cannot embrace them, without losing his hopes of Salvation. In the managing of the Controversie, if he seem not to write in the Defence of any other Reformed Church; his Answer is, that he does not write to the Adversaries of the Reformed Religion, in any other than in his Majesties Dominions. And if his Defence of our Church be sufficient, it will overthrow that Infallibility of the Roman Church, by which she pretends a Jurisdiction over all others, and by which alone all her particular

A Preface.

ticular Impositions are Justifiable. Which will afford an easie Apology to other Churches who do not think themselves oblig'd to submit to those Impositions.

THE

T H E C O N T E N T S.

T hat there are many false Notions of Popery	Page 1.
Wherein the true Notion of it consists	2.
<i>Viz.</i> Chiefly, in owning the Popes pretended Authority; and consequently, in submitting to his Terms of Com- munion	3.
This proved, I. In that all the other points of Popery were establish'd by this pretended Authority.	5.
II. The owning of it is that on which the Papists chiefly insist	7.
III. It is the most hurtful to Church and State	12.
And therefore worst in Construction of our Laws	18.
That there is therefore a real difference between Pa- pists	24.
For that they are not properly called so that deny the Popes Supremacy	25.
And they that own it in spirituals only, are less perfectly Papists than they that own it both in Spirituals and Temporals	26.
That accordingly to distinguish between them by Laws is the only true way for the suppressing of Popery	27.
That undistinguishing Severity is not the way. For I. It is a way that being taken would not be effectual	28.
II. It.	

The Contents,

II. It would not seem Just and Equal	33.
III. It would be against the Interest of England	42.
And would promote the Roman Interest	Page 49.
A Toleration of all Sects among us would be most pleasing to them at Rome	52.
But next to it, an undistinguishing Severity against all Roman Catholics	57.
That to distinguish between such of them as will give Security to the State and such as will not	
I. Would be an effectual way to suppress Popery	61.
II. That it would be Just and Equal	71.
III. That it would be for the Interest of England	76.
It would cause many to fall under the Pope's Censures	78.
And thereby give them occasion to consider	
How groundless the Pope's pretence is to an Authority over us	81.
How justly it was thrown out of England by K. Henry VIII.	90.
And afterward by Q. Elizabeth	108.
The Justifiableness of the Reformation	111.
If it should fail of this Effect, yet it would make them sure to our Civil Interests	133.
Objections against this way of Discrimination as not being Practicable	135.
I. The Roman Church and Court are all one in their Principles; being obliged to own the Popes Authority	137.
1. in Spiritual things	138.
2. and also in Temporals	144.
Answer to this Objection	150.

II. They

The Contents.

II. <i>They have ways to elude all the Assurance they can give us</i>	152.
<i>Answer to this Objection</i>	154.
III. <i>We can have no Assurance of their Constancy</i>	} 158
<i>Answer to this Conclusion</i>	
	160.

THE

The Reader is desired to take notice that the Quotations out of L. Herbert's History of K. Henry VIII. were taken at distant times out of two Books of different Editions, and not Paged alike; and that this was not observed, till those sheets in which the Quotations are had past the Press.

The ERRATA of any Moment are to be Corrected as follows.

P Ag. 2. lin. 13. (anciently famous) p. 14 l. 25. of this. p. 17. l. 31. And yet that. p. 29. l. 14, 15. no Parenthesis. p. 46. l. 33. in the *margin* lb. ann. 1602. p. 276. p. 47. l. 1. in the *margin* put out the same words. ibid. l. 24. dependance on the. p. 53. l. 33. undistinguishing execution of Laws. p. 58. l. 33. convince such a one that all his. p. 64. l. 9. in their streets. p. 67. l. 27. pretence to the. p. 81. l. 6. Christ, he. p. 84. l. 14. Churches Epistle to. p. 85. *margin*, last line, *Ann* 445. p. 51. l. 8. in *margin*. *Schism*. p. 103. b. *Edit*. 1585. p. 92. l. 19. he would never. l. 15. in *margin*. L. *Herb*. *Anno* 1529. p. 271. l. 26. in *margin*. the First. l. 29. *Pallavic*. *Hist*. *Conc*. *Trent*. II. 15. 5. p. 94. *margin*. l. 4. *Camd*. lb. p. 1. & 2. p. 94. l. 20. delays, and either. p. 100. l. 1. Three. p. 101. l. 28. & 29. (to use his own words) p. 102. l. 12. large an account. p. 104. l. 29. Particularly *should begin a Paragraph*. p. 107. l. 30. had his Traitorous. p. 113. l. 26. in *margin*. *Camd*. *Elliz*. p. 13. l. 29. in *margin*. she put out. p. 115. l. 30. *pass* without any.

Considerations

About the true way of Suppressing

POPERY

IN THIS

KINGDOM.



AMong the ignorant Vulgar, there are many false and wild Notions of Popery; some of which being admitted to be true, would render the Church of *England*, and all other Reformed Churches Popish. Other Notions of it would in like manner stigmatize all those Famous Churches in the more remote parts of the World, which have not been in Communion with the Pope these eight hundred years. And others, in the last place, would no less deeply brand those who are most given to asperse others, even the wildest of Phanatics and Enthusiasts themselves, as being Popishly principled.

If it be, as sure it is, very absurd to charge Popery on those eminent Eastern and Western Churches, which ever since the Separation of the

All Churches and Sects are Popish according to some mens Notions of Popery.

No Rites nor
Doctrines
common to
other Churches, which
are not in
Communion
with the Pope,
can be Popish,
but in a false
Notion of the
word.

one, and the Reformation of the other, have purged forth, and kept themselves free from all that which is properly Popish; and have therefore been anathematized by the Pope himself, and excluded from the Communion of all those Christians which hold him for their Ecclesiastical Head: It must also be no less absurd to charge with Popery those Tenets of Belief, and Rites of Worship (however false and unnecessary in themselves) wherein the Roman Catholick Churches differ from the English Protestant, and other Churches of the Reformation; but agree with those anciently famous Patriarchal Churches; and almost with all other in the remote parts of the World.

Having thus, how briefly soever, said what may be sufficient, to exclude the many, both incongruous and injurious Notions of *Popery*; which also would be insignificant, if they were admitted, I shall in the next place endeavour to set forth the only true, proper and significant notion of it.

And yet if I be not much deceived, 'twill be no hard matter to fix upon, and shew wherein this only right Notion of *Popery* does consist. The very derivation of the word, and obvious reason of the thing, necessarily imported thereby, may assure us, it cannot in a few significant words be describ'd to be either less, or more, or any way other, than *An undue adhesion to the Bishop of Rome, in Principles or Practices falsely pretended to be Christian.*

The true Notion of Popery describ'd.

I say, *To the Bishop of Rome*, because he it is that hath for many Ages past, appropriated to himself the name of *Pope*, which was formerly common to all Bishops; as every one knows that has been conversant in the Writings of the Fathers.

I say also, *An undue adhesion in Principles, &c.* for it's supposed to be an ill thing that is to be *supprest*. Now it is not ill to confess the Apostles Creed, or to do any good thing that he does; but to follow him, or to joyn with him in any thing that is evil; that is chiefly, to assert an undue Power or Authority in the Pope, such as that which he assumes to himself over the whole Christian Church; and consequently, to embrace and to practice those Errours and Corruptions (whatsoever they are) that by virtue of that usurpt Power and Authority, he imposes on all those that are or shall be in Communion with him; and excommunicates all that will not come to those terms; not so much for their Aversness to those Doctrines and Practices, as because they will not submit to his Power and Authority.

Though I must withal observe here, as consequential to my former Observation of so many false Notions of *Popery*, that laying aside its Capital Errour; (*viz.* That which directly asserts the pretended universal Power of the Pope) it is no necessary evil of any inferiour, subservient Errours or Practices, at least, of any of those which are not peculiar to the Roman Church (how false or vain soever they be in themselves) but the unnecessary embracing them out of pure

submission to the usurpt Authority of the Roman Bishop, now stiled *Pope*, and the only *Pope* of the World, is it, that in any right sense of the word, renders them truly *Popish*. And this I must acknowledge to be so, whether we regard the Derivation of the word, or Reasons of the thing it self. I mean, those Reasons which evince the only proper significant Notion of *Popery*, 'to be that which I have given before in the fewest words I could well fix upon to define or describe it.

What those Reasons are, we have, as to one part of them, seen already (by seeing that if Popery be taken otherwise, all Christian Churches in the World must be confessedly Popish;) and as to the other part also, we shall now see.

Of the Pope's
Authority o-
ver all Chri-
stians.

For now I am to shew, that even by the judgment of such as ought best to understand their own Doctrine, the very chief thing in Popery, is the owning and asserting the Papal Authority. Without question, there is nothing which they have more driven at from the beginning, or which they now more eagerly contend for in the Roman Church, and especially the governing part of it; as it were easie to shew in many instances; but a few will suffice, because the matter is so well known to all men of Reading and Experience.

To begin with the Original of Popery. There is nothing more certain and plain in Church-History, then that the primitive Christians, being generally Subjects of the Roman Empire, had a very great respect for the Bishops of *Rome*, because that was the Imperial City. And yet it is as plain, that those

those Bishops had no Authority or Jurisdiction out of their own Province, that is beyond the suburbicary Region of *Italy*, till after the Division of the Roman Empire into Eastern and Western. It was not long after that division, and chiefly upon the weakness of the Western Empire, that that Power, which we now call the Papacy, grew up. As the Empire decay'd, so by degrees it encreased and gathered strength; the design being at first, not to set up a new Religion, but a new Monarchy in the place of the old then expiring. The *Cæsars* having made *Rome* their seat of Empire for so many Ages, and being at last driven out by the barbarous Nations, it seem'd as if the Genius of the place had inspir'd the Roman Bishops to perk up, and to erect a new Empire in the stead. Which was no hard thing for them to do, being assisted with all manner of advantageous circumstances.

This Authority was the first thing in Popery.

Having learn'd from their Predecessors, to derive their descent from *St. Peter*, how truly, it matters not, this gave them colour enough to take upon them to be all that he was. Their See, their Traditions, their Dictates, were all stiled *Apostolical*. The Popes Title was then, *His Apostleship*; for *His Holiness* was too Vulgar in those days. Whatsoever Preheminence or Power those *Cæsars* by their Laws, or their Subjects the Christian Bishops in their Councils had given them, as being Bishops of the Imperial City, when they had gain'd the City wholly to their Devotion, and made their party among the barbarous Nations, they scorn'd to hold it any longer by gift:

gift. All that had been so given them, and whatsoever they grasp'd more, they held it *Jure Divino*, as being Heirs and Successors to St. *Peter*. By this means having shook off their Obligation to Canons and Laws, they took upon them to be as Infallible as St. *Peter* was; whose very name they did not stick to usurp when they pleased, as if *Christ* had spoken to them, whatsoever he said personally to *Cephas*. And whosoever objected (as some always did) that those Pretensions were new, and that there is no ground for them in Scripture, they could then face them down with those things which now they do not love to hear of; namely, with forg'd decretal Epistles, or Councils, or Fathers, or with pretended Revelations and Visions, or with counterfeited Miracles. For all which they had those at their beck, who (though ignorant enough otherwise) had more learning and skill to forge such things, than others had at that time to disprove them.

All other Popish Errours were brought in by it.

Thus in a blind Age (nay many Ages together) when this part of the World was conducted and governed in spiritual things by one-eyed men, for the Popes themselves were no better, it is no wonder that the generality of the people ran into so many Errours as they did, to the great hurt and scandal of the Christian Religion. And though 'tis charitable to believe, that at first there was no design to have those Errours obtruded on the Faith of Posterity; yet appearing to be such, as might be of great use for the wealth and greatness of the Clergy, who were strongly attach'd to the Roman See, nay some of them to the

the Advancement of the Papacy it self: the Pope had great cause to look kindly upon them, and to wish they were no Errours, but Catholick Doctrines (and if he pleas'd to have them such, who durst say they were otherwise?) When they had once receiv'd that publick countenance from him, he had much greater cause to continue it, and by all possible ways to keep them in possession of that esteem which those dark times had given them. And that not only for affection, as before, on the account of their usefulness to himself and his Clergy; but for fear that if these Errours were detected and brought in disgrace, it might reflect on the Infallibility of the Roman See, and might give men occasion to look farther, and to examine the whole Fabrick of Popery; which being search'd to the bottom, it could not but appear, that the Fundamental Errour was that which gave the Pope such a Power and Authority over the whole Christian Church.

This was truly the cause why such care was continually taken in all the latter general Councils (for so the Pope was pleas'd to call those Conventions of his Vassels, in which nothing pass'd but what he pleas'd) to establish those popular Errours as they grew up, and to put them out of question by their Canons and Decrees. Whereas the great capital Errour was never defin'd, but supposed, and pass'd (as all Fundamentals do) by such a general consent, as is stronger than all positive Laws whatsoever.

It pass'd thus for many Ages, till upon occasion of that long Schism, when for about fifty years,
the

All other Popish Errours were brought in by it.

the Western Church carried double, a Pope and an Antipope, that rid Cursing and Damning one another, the Council of *Constance* being met to judge which was which, deposed both, and began to set bounds to the Papacy. It was follow'd by the Council of *Basil*; which presuming to do the same, and being likely enough to have gone farther; the Pope that then was, call'd an opposite Council, and therein settled his Authority by a Law. It was the Council of *Florence*, which though not acknowledg'd by many Roman Catholics abroad, and particularly, not by the generality of them in *France*: Yet since I write this to English men, I shall shew what they of our Nation thought of it, at the last Revolution to Popery; from whence we may take some kind of measure, and guess what many would be at again. It was declar'd by the Cardinal Legate, * with consent of his Synod at *London*, that *the cause of all the evils in this Church, sprang from hence, that departing from the Unity and Doctrine of the Catholick Church, we had relinquished the Authority and Obedience of the Pope of Rome, Christ's Vicar, and the Successor of Peter.* The denial of this Authority, was declar'd * to be the chief Errour of Protestants. To correct which, they thought fit to set forth the true Doctrine, as it was delivered in the Eighth General Council at *Florence*, held under Pope *Eugenius IV.* of happy memory, in these words: *We declare, That the holy Apostolical See and Pope of Rome, holds the Primacy over all the World; and that the Pope of Rome is the Successor of St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, and is the true*

* *Polit. Reformatio Angliae*
decr. 1.

* *Ib. decr. 2.*

true Vicar of Christ, and Head of the whole Church, and Father and Teacher of all Christians; and that to him, in St. Peter, our Lord Jesus Christ gave full power to feed, rule and govern the Universal Church.

Since the Council of Florence, there have been only two pretended General Councils; namely, the fifth *Lateran*, and the Council of *Trent*; both which were acknowledged by that Synod of *London* above mentioned. The fifth *Lateran* Council was call'd by the Pope, for no other end, but that he might be able to write their Approbation in the stile of those Bulls which he should publish for the greatness of the Papacy. In the first of those Bulls, he damn'd the *Pisan* Council, which the French King had assembled against him. In the second, ⁴ he laid an Interdict on the whole Kingdom of *France*, and ordered the Fair of *Lions* to be removed from thence to *Geneva*. In a third, ⁵ he annulled the famous pragmatick Sanction, the *Palladium* of the French Church. And so went on, till having brought the French King to his terms, his next Bull ⁶ was, to set himself above all General Councils; and to declare, That a'l Christians, *sub necessitate salutis*, under pain of Damnation, must be subject to the Pope of *Rome*, according to that *Luciferian* Constitution of *Boniface VIII*, which he mentions and approves, and confirms. All this he does with consent of that Council. The Council of *Trent*, which came last, and pinn'd the Basket, not only took care to leave the Pope in full possession of this usurp'd Power, by declaring, ⁷ that no act of theirs should in-

⁴ Conc. Lateran.
1st Sess. 2.

⁴ Sess. 3.

⁵ Sess. 4.

⁶ Sess. 11.

⁷ Conc. Trident.
Sess. 25. decret.
de Reform. c. 21.

1. 16. c. 2.

1. 16. in Contin.
decr. 5.

fringe it, and by making him Judge and Interpreter of all their Decrees; but also confirmed it to him, as much as in them lay. For they ordained, ^a That in every Church of the Roman Communion, at the first Provincial Synod after that Council, every Member thereof, should promise and profess true Obedience to the Pope; and that all that were preferr'd for the future, whether to Bishoprick, Dignity, or Cure of Souls, should promise and swear the like Obedience, in such form as the Pope should prescribe. Whereupon Pope *Pius IV.* made that form of Profession of Faith, that is every where taken at this day; whereof one Clause is, *I promise and swear true Obedience to the Pope of Rome, Successor to St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar of Jesus Christ.*

Beside these publick Acts, which have a general influence on all parts and Members of the Roman Communion; there is a special tye on the governing part of it (if not by their interest) by another Oath, which is taken by all Archbishops, Bishops & Abbots at their Consecration. The form of it is prescrib'd in the Roman *Pontificale*, to which I refer the Reader that would see it at large. There he may see how all Church-Governours of that Communion, bind themselves to the Pope, to be his Liege-men and Subjects, his Counsel-keepers, his Spies and Intelligencers, his constant Correspondents, his Factors, his sworn Servants, in express terms, *To the utmost of their power to persecute and impugn all Hereticks, Schismaticks and Rebels against the Pope* (their own natural

tural Prince, Parents, Kindred and Friends not excepted.) I wish every Protestant (who is in their sense an Heretick, &c.) would be pleas'd to read that Oath, and then judge what he is to expect from any of these men, unless he knows they are such as will be perjur'd for his sake.

It was surely not without cause, that Cardinal *Bellarmino* call'd the Doctrine of the Pope's Authority over all Christians, *Caput Fidei*, the Head of the Catholick Faith. I have shewn that it is so in their sense of the word *Catholick*. A Doctrine that is the only Fundamental of Popery; the Foundation whereof was first laid in the Papal Authority, and the whole Building of Popery in other points, has been rais'd in favour to it. A Doctrine that has since been secured and confirmed by Canons of Councils, and by the Oaths of all their Clergy. A Doctrine to which the Leaders and Guides of their Church, are sworn to sacrifice all that's dear to them: And which way the Guides go, there's no fear but the Laity will follow them with that blind Obedience, which is peculiar to them in the Roman Church.

And therefore whatsoever Notion we have of Popery in other things, the Pope himself is not so fond of them, but that to gain the point of Authority, he can either connive, or abate, or part with them wholly, if he pleases: Though no doubt he never does it, but insidiously, as well knowing, that whatsoever Concession he makes for the establishing of his Authority, he may afterwards annul, and will do it when soever he pleaseth.

Obedience to this Authority the only sure property of Roman Catholics.

But that the owning his Authority, is the thing which makes a Catholick in his sense, and that only, it appears by sundry Instances abroad; but none more memorable then those which we have had here in *England*. Where King *Henry VIII.* having cast off his Obedience to the Pope, was therefore judged a Heretick; and underwent the worst that *Rome* could have done to him, if he had rejected all their Errours together; and yet he asserted all the rest, and imposed them with the utmost severity. He was a through-Papist in all points, but only that of Obedience; in comparison whereof, all the rest are but talk. That is the business, as we are taught by this example. And we are not a little confirm'd by the proceeding on the other hand, with his daughter *Elizabeth*; who being as much a Protestant as any is, or can be at this day; and having so settled Religion in her Kingdom, that it had scarce been in her power to have altered it, how and when she pleased; yet if she could but have been brought to acknowledge the Popes Authority, to which she was courted by all possible ways, how gladly would his Holiness have received her? and abated for lesser things, that is, for all things else; if it be true, that the Pope would have allowed her the English Liturgy that then was, and the Communion-Service, as it was generally reported he would: And we have the more cause to believe it, because we hear of the like offers prepared for us, in order to perswade the restoring of Popery in our days.

*Camd. Eliz.
anno 1560.*

I conceive it is sufficiently proved, that the chief thing in Popery, is the Doctrine which asserts the Popes Authority over all Christians. I shall adde, that it is the worst of all the evils which Popery contains, the most hurtful and mischievous both to Church and State; which being proved to my hand in sundry Learned Discourses within these few years, I shall not need to say much on this head.

It is also the worst thing in Popery.

Yet I cannot but mind the Reader of that which is most notorious, and which every one knoweth, that hath read over almost any History of these last Eight hundred years. For about so long since it was, that the Church received the greatest Wound that ever was given it, a Breach not to be repaired, a Schism that reacheth throughout the whole Universe. So long a time the Western Church, that is, the Western part of *Europe*, hath been a Church by it self; having broke off all Communion with all other Churches in the World, that is, with all the *Asian* and *African* Churches, and all those in the East and North parts of *Europe*. Instead of that Love and Peace which Christ left as his Legacy among Christians, there hath been for so many Ages nothing else but Banning and Cursing between them. As the Pope yearly curses all those Christians that are not of his Communion; so he and his are yearly curst by the four ancient Patriarchs of *Constantinople*, *Alexandria*, *Antioch* and *Jerusalem*; and by all the Christian Churches depending on them, except those few whom he hath conquer'd, or bought, or otherwise gain'd by his Missionaries. The original

ginal cause of this Breach, was nothing else but the Popes Usurpation, which those Churches were not able to bear. It was the same cause, that many Ages after, divided this Western part of *Europe* within it self. For our Church was thrown out of the Roman Communion, many years before any thing else was reformed in it; when there was no other difference between us, but only this, that we had cast off the Popes Usurpation.

This breach of Christian-Unity, were of it self a great mischief to the Church, though nothing else came of it but Hatred and Unchristian Censures, in which perhaps, both sides might be to blame, but yet they might live and grow wiser, and come at last to understand one another. And this would possibly ensue upon any other difference of Opinion. But this grand point of Popery is such, as sets men in no ordinary heat; it makes them breath not only Censures, but Death against their Adversaries; it arms out all the Wealth, Power and Policy of them that hold it, to reduce or destroy all them that oppose it. Not to rip up ancient stories, we have a sad instance this in the Greek Church, which refusing to submit to the Pope, was betray'd by him to the Turk; under whom it hath groaned these two hundred years. In all which time of bondage and misery, which that poor Church hath endured, what relief hath she had from the Interest or Wealth of the Papacy? I cannot say, but there have been, and are daily great returns thither of money from *Rome*; but all the use of them, is to hire her Children

Children against her for bread; or to bribe the Turks Bassa's to do her all the hurt that is possible. We have the less cause to take it ill, if we find the Popes Agents busie among us, and if we feel the woful effects of their diligence, in our intestine Divisions, and in the growth of Atheism, which we cannot but be sadly sensible; are both much increased since the late Toleration. In these and the like practises, they plainly declare, that rather then not bring in Popery, they would drive out Christianity before them; and not leave the name of Christ to the people, that will not receive the Pope as his Vicar.

How those Churches where he is so received and bears rule, as he would do among us, are blessed in it, we may partly guess by the means that he employs to get us under him. For it is seldom known, that they who are so greedy of power, use it well when they have it. But not to go by guess, when we have a Map before us: We may see the condition of his Subjects describ'd by some of themselves, that writ in those times when men durst write of such things; when there was no Inquisition for them, nor no *Index Expurgatorius* for their Writings. I believe, a more cruel Bondage, a more miserable Thralldom and Yoke then they describe never was among the barbarous Nations. I believe also the Inquisition, where it is introduc'd, hath not made their condition easier since. And that it is not introduc'd in some Countreys, as namely, in *France* and *Flanders*, they may thank the poor Protestants for it: Where such are, the Pope will have a care

care not to make too much noise, for fear of frightening away the Birds that he would take. And yet in *France*, where there is no Inquisition, he found other ways not long since, to make the *'Janjenists* feel the weight of his hand, and that severely; for no other reason, but because in certain School-points, they presum'd to oppose another party that were more firm to his Interests.

If this be his way of keeping Unity, for which they so much cry up his Government (though men do not speak so well of the *Russian*, which keeps Unity better :) I see no reason why we should not be content, and endure our dissensions; or rather find some other way to compose them, than by putting our necks into a yoke, which being once fastned, it will be too late for us to complain afterward. We must either draw as he would have us, or else go to the Shambles.

For the Temporal State, how it hath been turmoild with this Papal Usurpation, would ask a large Book to describe, as the matter deserves. I shall only say this, that ever since it began, it hath hung like a Comet, over Kingdoms and Nations, and shed forth direful Influences on all that have been any way obnoxious to it. But it came not to its height, till Pope *Hildebrand's* days, whom their heavenly Muster-Roll * calleth *St. Gregory VII.* A Saint, no doubt, worthy of Red Letters; for he caused the shedding of more Christian Blood than *Mahomet* himself; and as *Mahomet* did, he taught his Sect to do the same, and merit Heaven by it. His Dictates are commonly

* *Martyrolog.*
Roman. Maii
25.

monly known, being publish'd, both in his Books, and in the Councils. I appeal to any one that hath read them, whether Antichrist at his coming (if he be yet to come) can * *speake greater things.* * Rev. 13. 4. Sure I am, nothing can be more contrary to the humble and meek spirit of Christ. Among these, there is one Doctrine briefly expressed, but more amply declared in his Bulls, and in his actions pursuant to them. It is concerning a power that he assumes to himself to depose Kings, and to dispose of their Kingdoms. Which Arrogant Claim (such as none but the Devil * ever made before him) * Luke 4. 6. hath ever since been continued by his Successors; and yet is, as often as they see occasion, both declared and manifested by the like Bulls and actions. The woful effects of it throughout this Western part of *Europe*, are notoriously known to all that read History; having torn the Bowels of this part of Christendom like an Earthquake, for these last six hundred years, having shaken the Foundations of all Empires, Kingdoms and States, involving all of them, at one time or other, in bloody and cruel Wars, accursed and unnatural Rebellions, and all other consequent Calamities. In *Germany* particularly, where it first began to operate: The two next Emperours were fain to fight no less than sixty Field-battels to keep their Crowns upon their Heads. In *France* it hath wrought proportionably. Other Countreys have suffered their share. But none more than *England* in King *John's* miserable days. And that had been forgotten in 88. if the design had taken, which God only could, and did defeat; when otherwise this Do-

D

ctrine,

ctrine, in all probability, had destroyed the English Kingdom and Nation, we had been gone, and our name had scarce remained upon the face of the Earth.

It is worst in
the Construc-
tion of the
Law.

The sad experience of the manifold mischiefs and dangers, both to Church and State, from this pretended Authority, taught our Fore-fathers at sundry times, to provide against it by Laws, with such Penalties annex'd to them, as they found needful, to prevent the like mischiefs and dangers for the future. It appears, that the ancientest Laws of this kind, were made by them that lived and died in the Roman Communion: I mean, the Laws of *Provisors* and *Premunire*, enacted some hundreds of years since by Roman Catholick Kings and their Parliaments; who could have no design against any other of those things we call Popery; for they held the same erroneous Opinions which our now-Papists do, though they held them not as Articles of Faith. But they endeavoured by those Laws, to secure themselves against the daily Encroachment of the Pope, and his Faction in the Roman Church. When those Banks were found insufficient to restrain the growing Torrent within its bounds, they found it needful to stop the Channel, to exclude the Papacy it self, and turn it out of the Kingdom. This was done by King *Henry VIII*, upon such a Provocation, as perhaps would have moved a much gentler Prince to do the same. For he was made to dance Attendance upon the Court of *Rome* five or six years, for Sentence in a Cause, which he commenced not of himself, but by advice of the

the Popes Legat, and his Confessor: A Cause which the Pope himself at first had encouraged; in which he had the judgment of the whole Church of *England*, and divers Foreign Universities of his side. His exclusion of the Papal Authority was by Acts both of Parliament, and of Convocation, almost no man dissenting. They both form'd the Oath of Supremacy, and took it themselves, and joyn'd with him in imposing it, in direct opposition to this grand point. And yet this King himself, and all the Members of those Bodies, were firm to all things else that we call Popery.

It was otherwise in the time of Queen *Elizabeth*, of blessed Memory; who, at the entrance of her Reign, not only repair'd her Father's Fence against the Papal Authority, but also purged the Church of all those Errours and Corruptions, which are yet retain'd and own'd by all them of the Roman Communion. And yet she laid no penalty on any of them, but the loss of their Ecclesiastical Preferments, and the payment of Twelve pence for every *Sunday* that they were absent from Church. This is all that they suffer'd for many years, till the Pope took upon him to turn her out of her Kingdom. When he had publish'd his Bull to that purpose, and sent it hither among her Subjects, and some of them had taken Arms, and tried all ways to put that Bull in execution; then she enacted a *Camd. Eliz. Anno 1571.* Law, to forbid any of her Subjects, under pain of Premunire, to bring Bulls, or any other such Trumpery from *Rome*, and made it Treason for any of them to be reconciled (as they call it) to the Ro-

man Church. Yet for six years more, though some were taken in the offence, none suffer'd the penalty of that Law. When the Pope proceeded further in Hostility against her, to give away her Crown, to invade her Dominions, and to practise against her life; when she found, that under pretence of Religion, he drew over many of her Subjects, and train'd them up as his spiritual Janizaries, in Houses founded for that purpose; when she found, that at their return, they fully answered the ends of their Education, and rather list'd Souldiers against her, than made Profelytes to their Religion; then she executed those former Laws, and made more from time to time, as they gave her occasion. In which Laws, though she found it necessary to forbid sundry Acts which were purely Religious, and to make it penal to such as were taken at them, because she had no other way to find out them that were dangerous to the state; yet she made it sufficiently appear, that the design of such Laws was only against dangerous persons, by the great care she took to turn the edge of them from those that were otherwise. She gave private Instructions to her Judges, that before any was to suffer by the Sanguinary Laws, they should examine him how he stood affected to the State; whether he owned *Hildebrands* Doctrine; whether he approved the Popes Sentence; whether he would side with him against her Majesty. If they found any one, in those Circumstances of a Prisoner dead in Law, so desperately bold, that he durst own a Foreign power, in defiance of her that had his life at her mercy; she

11. Anno 1577.

11. Anno 1581.

she would not have her Judges spare him, that she might be very sure, would not have spared her nor her Kingdom. Otherwise, if they stood right as to the Civil Authority, it was her will that none should suffer death. And though they were such of the Clergy, whom she knew to be the Popes Disciples and Pensioners, and therefore thought it not safe to trust them in her Kingdom; yet if they gave her a fair answer, she sent them out of it quietly. And thus she dismiss'd * some of them, that proved afterward as errant Traytors as any whom she put to death. But for many other of their Clergy, and especially those who were Priests in Queen *Mary's* days, knowing them to be of peaceable Principles, she suffered them to live peaceably in her Kingdom. Of the Laity likewise, she put none to death, that would disown the Popes temporal power. She took only a pecuniary Mulct, with which she thought fit to repair her self for the charge she was put to in defending her self against the Head of their Communion. When that charge was apprehended to be over; namely, at King *James* his coming to the Crown, they were discharged even of those pecuniary penalties. The King knew of no Sentence that the Pope had issued forth against himself; and finding no trouble from those of his Communion, he was willing to give none. Nor did he, till he had tried them. None suffer'd among them in any kind; none had cause to be in fear of any suffering; no distinction was made between them and other Subjects. But this calm was soon interrupted, by the breaking out of a Conspiracy,

* *Rishon* says
it of himself
in his virulent
Cont. of Sand.
de Schism.
Angl.

Conspiracy, which yet seemed only to waken the vigilance of the State. For no great matter was done upon it, till another broke forth, that of the Powder-Treason, which out-went all former examples. And then (when it was almost too late) he understood by searching into this Conspiracy, that though the Pope had not deprived him by name of the Kingdom, yet he had barred his right to it by a sufficient Description; having sent out two Breves before the Queens death, in which he commanded all his Catholicks, not to suffer any *Protestant, how near soever in Blood*, to succeed her in the Kingdom. This Papal Precept it was, to which the Authors themselves ascribed their Gunpowder-Treason. And that the King might not always be in the like danger, he saw no way but to punish them that heeded such Precepts. Other Papists he excused, and made himself, as it were, their Compurgator, declaring to the World, that he believ'd they were innocent and peaceable. Only they were not to be excused for keeping ill Company: For they joyned in all Religious Acts with those of *Hildebrand's* Sect; therefore they ought not to think much if their purses paid for it. But otherwise the King did what lay in him to distinguish them. And therefore he provided the Oath of Alleigance, by the taking or refusing whereof, he might be able to know the one from the other. That Oath was made at first in such Terms, as might perhaps have raised scruple in those that held the Papacy, to be of Divine Right, though not in Temporals, but only in Spiritual things. Though most of that

Com-

Communion held otherwise in *France*, and few held so in *England*, in King *Henry VIII's* days. Yet lest that might stick with any innocent person; the King, that desired to hurt none that might be spared, and well knowing all their Principles, for he had studied their Authors; therefore took upon him so to moderate the Oath, that it could not pinch the Conscience of any Roman Catholick that was not first infected with *Hildebrand's* Principles. And they were generally so well satisfied with the Oath in those Terms, in which he had conceived it, that it was forthwith taken by the Superior of the Secular Clergy, and by many other, both of the Clergy and Laity. Few stuck at it, but those of *Hildebrand's* Sect; whom the King had a mind to single out of the Herd, and to rid the Land of them, that he might live quietly with the other Roman Catholicks. But this pleased not at *Rome*, where only those are the Darlings. And it concerned the Pope, to assert his own power in Temporals; which being something the younger, he is more fond of than that in Spirituals; and yet the elder being the more popular, he wilfully mistook, and perswaded the people (as if he had believed himself) that the Oath was against his power in Spirituals. But he mistook not in forbidding the Oath of Allegiance to be taken by any Catholick, upon any Terms whatsoever. His Prohibition was under pain of his Curse; both which were confirm'd by one or more Popes since. And yet many of their Church took that Oath, and some of them defended it in writing; and 'tis taken and defend-
ed

ed in like manner to this day. By many others it is, and hath been refused : Whether as being contrary to the Principles of their Sect, or whether in Reverence to the Popes Prohibition; and possibly some may have refused to take the Oath, upon some scruple which they have conceived against the wording of it.

But whatsoever the cause of their refusal may be, the State hath no way left to distinguish ; and therefore being assured of the lawfulness of the Oath in these Terms, and being aware of the wicked design with which it is forbidden, hath just cause to secure it self by their peril. It hath surely no cause to look on them as Friends, that prefer their own scruples to its safety ; much less, that break its just Commands, to serve or to please its open Enemy. And for this cause, that wise and gracious Prince suffered some of their Clergy that were obnoxious otherwise, to fall under the edge of the Law. But never in his nor his Sons days, did any one of that Communion, suffer death for any Crime against the State, that would clear himself of it by taking the Oath of Allegiance.

From what I have said, it sufficiently appears, that the asserting an undue Authority in the Pope or Bishop of *Rome*, is properly to be called Popery ; 'tis the chief thing, and the only thing in the Popes esteem ; 'tis most hurtful and dangerous, and the worst thing in the Construction of the Law. From whence I shall infer, that among Roman Catholicks, some are properly Papists, and some are improperly called so. And however they

Papist, an
equivocal
word.

they are both of one Communion, and meet together in the same Offices of Worship, and therefore cannot easily be distinguished ; (unless they please to distinguish themselves) yet there is a great difference between them : As great a difference in relation to the State, as there is between Wens and useful Members in the Body.

They that wholly deny the Popes Supremacy, Improperly cannot properly be called Papists, but *Unreformed Papists*, *Catholicks*; as men generally were here in *England*, in the later part of King *Henry VIII's* days. And they, as I believe, were the first that used the word *Papists*, to denote the Assertors of that outed Supremacy. Nor can they properly be called so in *France*, or other Countreys, who deny the Pope to have any Authority over them by Divine Right ; but grant it only by such Canons and Laws, as being made upon good Considerations, may on better, be abrogated and repealed. I know there are some of this mind in *England*, and do believe there would appear to be many, if they found sufficient cause to declare it. * Now though such men believe the same erroneous Tenets, and use the same Superstitious and Idolatrous Rites that Papists do ; namely, such as the Pope himself has made the Terms of his Communion, and therefore they are properly in Communion with him ; yet those Tenets and Rites are not properly Popery. Though they are bad enough otherwise, yet if they keep them to themselves, they are not hurtful to Humane Society : As being consistent with the safety of the Kingdom, and with obedience to Government, and with Ju-

* R. C. (i. e.)
Ricardus Chancelarius, alias,
Dr. Smith,
the last Roman Catho-
lick Bishop
that pretend-
ed Jurisdiction here in
England, was
of this mind,
as appears by
his Book a-
gainst the Bi-
shop of *Derry*,
entituled, *A*
Brief Survey,
&c.
Ibid. cap. 50. 55.
where he says,
'tis no point
of Faith, whe-
ther the Pope
be *St. Peter's*
Successor *jure*
Divino, or
Humano.

stice of Contracts, and love of Neighbours; with all which, at least collectively taken, Popery in the proper Notion of it is inconsistent; and generally held so, not only by all other Christians, but by a very great and considerable part of the Roman Catholicks themselves.

Half-Papists.

Thorough-Papists.

Their Description.

Zenzolini Glos-
sa; Dominus
Deus noster
Papa.
Vid. Glos. Ex-
travag. Cum
inter de verb.
signif. Edit. 1724
11, An. 1525.

They are properly Papists, that hold the Pope as Vicar of Christ, by Divine Right, to have a Power and Authority over all Christians. And yet if they give him this power in Spirituals only, and not also in Temporals, they are but *half-Papists*: And so they will find the Pope accounts them, if they have occasion to make use of him. They only are *thorough-Papists*, that acknowledge his Authority in both. First, directly in Spiritual things; and then in Temporals also, whether directly; or whether indirectly, in order to Spirituals, it matters not. Let him have the Power, and he will trust himself with the use of it. Now this *thorough-Papist*, being a man after the Popes own heart, I shall from him take the perfect measures of Popery. He is one that asserts and maintains, or at least practically submits to the Popes pretended Power and Usurpation; over all Kings and People in their Temporals; and over all Bishops and Churches in their Spirituals; and in all things, over all persons on earth, not only separately, but collectively, in their Parliaments or Councils; and consequently over all their Canons, Laws and Definitions. In few words, that owns him to be the Infallible Oracle, and Universal Vicar of God; a kind of God-upon Earth, who has no limits to his Commission; or to the execution

tion of it, but his own will and pleasure. This most excellent Systeme it is, that only passes at *Rome* for the Catholick Doctrine. This is authorized by the Pope, this is taught in his own Church at *Rome*, and elsewhere by his Stipendiaries or other Dependants. And this is properly Popish, for it belongs not to any other Christians of whatsoever Church, Sect or Denomination: Nor is it owned by the far greater number of them that are or call themselves Roman Catholicks.

I have given my own private Opinion, as well of the true, as of the false Notion of Popery; and have intimated withal (though but occasionally) what my Opinion is, as well of the great Concernment of the Christian World, if not of all Mankind, to suppress Popery, truly such; as of the little occasion there is, for any great severity to be used against that for Name-sake, which in truth is not Popery, nor has any essential or necessary conjunction with it.

Now to enter upon the main design of this Paper; which, according to the title, is a Consideration or Search for the true way of suppressing of Popery, I declare my design to be against Popery in its proper Notion. And whereas I have shewn a lower degree of it to consist in owning the Popes power in Spirituals only; by suppressing of this, I intend, at least, such a restraint upon it, as may suffice to keep it from being hurtful or troublesome. For the other degree, which cannot but be hurtful wheresoever it is in being: I declare my design to be no less, than the extinguishing of it, at least out of *England*, and,

The main
Argument.

if it were possible, from the face of the Earth.

Undistinguishing Severity is not the way to suppress Popery.

Of this matter to deliver my thoughts with all freedom, I confess it seems to me, that undistinguishing Severity, whether of Laws, or of the execution of them, against all Roman Catholicks in general, cannot be the true way to suppress Popery; much less to rid it out of this Kingdom, or any other of his Majesties Dominions.

The general Motives which induce me to think so, are these three: 1. That such a course in all likelihood, would not prove effectual. 2. That if it should prove effectual, yet it would be very far from seeming just or equitable. 3. It would be against the interest of *England* in divers Contingencies.

It would be ineffectual.

1. That it would be ineffectual, I am persuaded by the well-known experience of above a Hundred years, that is, of what hath pass'd in this Kingdom ever since the Reformation. For notwithstanding all the Penal Laws that have been made, and the execution of them, which was severe enough at some times; we see that still there have been Roman Catholicks ever since; and they were never so much lessen'd by their sufferings, as by the Court of Wards, which took off many of the wealthiest Families. But that which made them bear up against sufferings was this, as I humbly conceive, That by divers of our Laws, or by the Interpreters and Executors of them (especially of those Laws that had pecuniary Penalties) they saw no distinction made between loyal and disloyal; between peaceable and turbulent Principles;

ples; between matters simply of Religion, and those which threatned the State. The same cause is like to have the same effect still. And therefore I think we have just occasion to fear, that if all men of that Communion are still equally liable to the same punishments in any kind, and accordingly treated; it will be thought by themselves, if not by others also, that their suffering is for some Articles of Catholick Religion, and not for any Principles either of Treason, or other Papal Superstition (which Principles very many of them do as much, as any Protestant, with all their hearts abhor, and are ready to abjure.) And while they think so, it will undoubtedly cause (at least a considerable number of, them) to stand the utmost extremities; and thereby the Pope will peradventure gain more Proselytes to his Communion, and more strength to his side, than he will lose from it.

Besides, the number of their Priests at home, and of their Seminaries abroad, would not lessen, but increase, by such undistinguishing Severity. For divers of those Sufferers, being streightned with want, would send their Children beyond Sea, to get them off of their hands, to have them bred without charge, and put into a way of living. And they are so brought up, and so principled, in their Foreign Colledges, that let the Laws in *England* be never so severe, they will return hither, and not stick to venture their lives in the service. Seminaries also would increase. For they are so addicted to their Religion beyond Sea, that, let a Preacher in a good Town sollicite the
Charity

Charity of people towards the maintenance of such as shall expose their Lives to propagate their Religion, and there will quickly be a new Foundation erected for that purpose. The Colledge in *Sivill* was maintain'd by Alms, and I think that at *Valledolid* likewise, and yet Scholars lived no where better. These two Colledges, when the times were most severe to Roman-Catholicks, sent every year many Priests into *England*; and now in many years send none: But would undoubtedly grow numerous again, if the Fame of our Severity here should quicken the peoples Charity in those parts, which hath been slackned very much of late years.

Again, neighbouring Princes, who shall see men persecuted for the same Perswasions which they profess themselves, will interpose in their behalf; both of their own accord in some measure, and much more at the Popes Sollicitation; who will be sure to engage all the credit he has with them, on such an occasion: And the interest of all neighbour States are so interwoven, that at one time or other it will be found inconvenient not to gratifie them in such a request.

There will oftentimes happen another kind of Obstruction, even at home, from English Protestants themselves. For I think it ought to be considered, that many Roman Catholicks, however abused in their Judgments about some matters of Divine Belief or Worship, are esteemed by their Protestant neighbours honest, well-meaning men, such as they cannot find in their hearts to use hardly, without great and evident Cause. Others have

have Relations, or Friends, or Dependants, tied by several interests to them. And even strangers to the persons who are to suffer the penalties of the Laws, will think it hard to inflict them on men that are no otherwise liable, than merely for such Religious Tenets and Rites, as have been for many Ages warranted by the Laws, and held and practised by all Christian People amongst us.

So that, from one or other of these causes I have mentioned, it will prove a very difficult matter to have the Laws executed on Roman Catholics, without Discrimination; that is, without separating those who are so qualify'd for pity, from those who deserve none, in the judgment of any Protestant, nay of any true Englishman whatsoever. For no man that loveth the Peace of his Country, can think fit to spare them, who are so fond of a Foreign Government, that rather than not be under it, they will not spare to involve their Country in Blood and Misery. Other men of that Principle, have done as bad in former times. And we have cause to be jealous of all men of that Religion, that they are of the same Principles, and will do the same things; unless they will secure us by some Act, which they may lawfully do, being required to it. Now it is evident, we have too many such among us, who are thorough-Papists, and Ministers of that Foreign Government; and many others, who will not secure us by doing any such Act, that the State shall require, against the interest of that Foreign Government. Therefore the State hath
just

First cause to secure it self against them, by such Laws, as being executed, it shall not be in their power to do us hurt. But when those Laws are made without any distinction, they Herd themselves with others of their Communion; and being hunted together, they have some little trouble perhaps, which they laugh at, for they know it will come to nothing. After a while, good nature works in the Protestants; every man that should execute the Laws, knoweth some or other that deserve favour, and for their sakes he will punish none. So the Prosecution at first grows cold, and at last ceases; till some fresh Apprehension of Danger awakens us, and then there will be a little more stir, to no purpose, as we have seen more then once in our days.

But lastly, If the Laws are executed to the full, I speak of Laws made without Discrimination, whatsoever severity shall be used in pursuance of them, will chiefly light on the best and most innocent persons; on them that are truly English, and have nothing to do with *Rome*, save that they live within her Communion. For the thorough-paced Papist will shift better than the other can do. The Jesuites can equivocate, and teach their Scholars to do it. They can sail with every wind, and rather than lose their Port, they can do all that Protestants do. And if they have no Dispensation before hand, they can have a Pardon for it afterward: For they know where those things are to be had, which any honest man, though of that Religion, abhors either to ask or need. And if a Jesuite should have so over-slept himself, that
he

he is taken napping with other Catholicks ; he is sure to have Friends to bring him off. If none in *England* can do it, he has them abroad to help. If he be put to fly his Country, he knows whither to go. If he step short, and fall into a Prison ; there, at least, he is sure not to want either relief, or means for his deliverance. While the man of Loyal principles, if he fall into any of those Circumstances, is stuck, and knows not which way to look for help. For from whence should he have it ? At home he has no Friend that dares know him ; abroad he has no manner of interest. For all there depend upon the Pope ; who is so far from concerning himself for any, whom he knows to be no Papists, that he does not own them for Catholicks. And especially if any such be men of parts, whom he hears to be in Prison, or the like, he only wishes them hanged out of the way, that he may have the rest the more intirely at his Devotion.

Much more might be said on this head, but what I have said may suffice. And therefore to insist no longer on that Question, Whether undistinguishing Severity would be effectual or no ? I come now to shew, that if it should prove effectual, yet it would be very far from seeming just or equitable to indifferent men. And of this I am strongly assured, first, by all the judgment I can make of the Intention of our Laws ; secondly, by Arguments from the rule of right Reason, and the Ancient Practise of Christianity.

2. It would
not seem just
and equitable.

I begin with the former, and observe, That although the Severity of our Penal Statutes, according to the bare letter of them, generally not distinguishing between Papists and Roman Catholics, falls indifferently on both; yet, by the wording of them in several places, and by other Circumstances, it appears, that they were intended against the Abettors of undue Authority in the Pope, and against no other.

For what appears in the wording of the Statutes, I shall instance only two; viz. 23 *Eliz.* and 3. *Jacobi*: Whereof the former, namely, that of Queen *Elizabeth*, expresses the crime to be punished by the Statute, in these terms, *An intent to withdraw Subjects from their natural Obedience*. The other, namely, that of King *James*, which was very severe, as it ought to be on so great an occasion, mentions this as the crime to be punished by it: *The withdrawing Subjects from their natural Obedience, and moving them to promise Obedience to the pretended Authority of the See of ROME*.

That the Sanguinary Laws were intended against Popery in this sense, and no other, it may further appear by the Account I have given before; where I briefly set forth on what occasions they were made, and in what manner they were executed. It is evident, that none ever suffer'd Death as a Papist, who could be brought to take the Oath of Supremacy or Allegiance. Now it is certain, that those Oaths were primarily designed to be a sufficient Test to distinguish Papists from others. And yet in either of them, there is no mention made of any Doctrines, but only those which concern Govern-

It is to expressly provided in 27 *Eliz.* for the Oath of Supremacy, and 3 *Jac.* for the Oath of Allegiance.

Government; that is, the external Government both of Church and State. It is indeed objected by Papists against the Oath of Supremacy, and it sticks with some of those Roman Catholicks who are not Papists, that by the Oath of Supremacy, the King is made a spiritual Head of the Church. But he that reads the Oath, will find no such thing in it; and it is expressly declar'd by the Church of *England* in her Articles, That she ascribes to the King no other Jurisdiction over the Church, than what is meerly external; even the same that was exercised by the Kings of *Judah*, and the Christian Emperours, over the Church in their Kingdoms and Empires.

To this I may add, the constant Profession and Answer of all Protestant Writers. Whensoever any Complaint has been made of the severity used to Roman Catholicks, it has been always said, that they suffered not for Religion, but Treason. And this is a very plain and satisfactory Answer, while those only suffer who do those things, or hold those Tenets which involve Treason in them. But if they who do no such thing, and who renounce all such Tenets, are yet made to suffer in like manner; though they suffer for that which the Law declares to be Treason, it will bear some dispute, whether Law-makers may not miscall things. However, it shews the general sense of the Church and State of *England*; I mean, for what concerns the design or intention of those Penal Laws.

And here by the way it may be observed how very different our dealing with the Roman-Catholicks

Justitia Britannica 8^o Lond.
1584. and K.
James works,
p. 252. & 316.
and K. *Charlts I.*
vol. 1. p. 384.

licks is from their dealing with Protestants in *Q. Mary's* days. That then all profest Protestants were handled severely, and that many of them were put to death, I think none will deny. But to avoid the *Odium* of this, some of that Communion in our Age would persuade us that their suffering was not upon the Account of Religion. And, to colour this Evasion, they endeavour to show that *Cranmer*, and two or three more, had deserved death for Treason; which is more than they are able to prove. But admit this were true, that these men had deserved it; yet they did not suffer death for Treason, but Religion, as they would have it believed that made them dye. For they declared this throughout the whole course of their Criminal Proceedings. And it concerned them so to do. For, otherwise, by the Laws then in force, they had murdered as many as they burnt; there being no Law to Burn men for Treason, but for Heresie. And so far they were from using any Moderation, that they rather extended the Letter of the Law: by inflicting it on many poor Creatures, who had nothing to provoke any Jealousie against them; but enough to move pity, if there had been any, in their Adversaries. It has been the glory of our Church, that we have not been like them in this: nor can be, without altering the Design of them that made all our Laws against Popery.

The intention of our Laws appearing so manifestly, as I conceive, against Papists only, and not against any other Roman Catholicks; it seems not reasonable that any other but Papists should suffer by the Letter of those Laws. For it is a Maxim, That
not

not the bare Letter of any one or more Clause or Clauses, but the Intention of the whole Law is the Life and Soul of it. I mean, it is that which gives signification to words, & wth ought (where it is evident) to interpret the Law. It is also a Maxim, That all Penal Laws should be interpreted favourably; and therefore more should not be made Criminals, nor should any Criminal suffer more by any Law, than was meant by the Legislator. Now 'tis common only said, there are very many Roman Catholicks (I hope the far greater number of them in *England*) who maintain no Principles or Opinions, which destroy the Fundamentals of Government, or disturb the peace of the Kingdom; nor hold any of those Opinions which are essential to Popery, namely, which assert any undue Authority in the Pope, or (as it is express in the Statute) which *withdraw Subjects from their natural Obedience, or move them to promise Obedience to the pretended Authority of the See of Rome*. There are many of that Communion, who profess that they hate & detest all such Doctrines. And therefore to indifferent Judges, how can it but seem very hard to extend the severity of the Letter of our Penal Laws, against the Legislators intention, to all Roman Catholicks universally and indistinctly, without any exception in favour of those many that hold no such Opinions, and that are in all respects truly Loyal and peaceable? Surely the punishment cannot seem just or equitable, which has not the Law for it; and that has not the Law for it, which is against the intention of the Legislator.

Next I say, with submission, that granting the intention of the Statute-Laws of our Land, and of the

the Legislators by whom they were made, to have been against all Roman Catholicks indistinctly, and not only against the mere Papalins; yet according to the Eternal Law of Reason, and ancient practice of Christianity, it may seem in such case, than an undistinguishing execution of the Laws, would neither be just nor equitable.

For first, it seems very unreasonable, to go about to force men to change their judgments in any thing, that hurts none but themselves, and especially in so weighty a matter as is that of Religion. It is confess'd, that the Religion of Roman Catholicks, differs very much from that which is established by Law; and I am much to blame, if I know not it is Erroneous in those points in which it differs. For which Reason, I doubt not, they ought to be restrain'd from publick exercise of it, and (as far as it is possible) from hurting others by the Propagation of their Errours. I also grant, that by some kind of Punishment, less than death or ruine, men that err, may and ought to be awaken'd and stirr'd up to seek better Information, and to attend to the means of it, that they may be reclaim'd from their Errours. I also grant, that it belongs to the Legislative Power to define, how far, and by what means all this should be done; without which, I see no way to preserve established Truth, or to suppress Heresie in any Kingdom.

But all the punishment that is necessary for this purpose, may be inflicted without any force upon Conscience; as I shall have occasion to shew toward the end of this Paper. Much less is that any force upon Conscience, when men are punish'd
for

for Treason, or for treasonable Principles. For those Principles are Treason in Bullion, and will be coyn'd out, whensoever the Pope pleases to set the Mint going; and that he will do, whensoever he thinks it time to pay off any King that does not please him. But I cannot say so, when men that have no such Principles, are punish'd as if they had; and are either put to death, or made unable to live, unless they will part with those things in their Religion which are purely and simply erroneous, and which have no ill influence upon the State any otherwise than as it is inconvenient to have different Religions in being together in the Kingdom. This Severity is truly a force upon Conscience. And 'tis very unreasonable besides, that the simply erroneous should be made to feel the weight of that punishment, than which no greater could be inflicted by Law, if their Errours were heightned and envenom'd with all the Malignity of that which we call properly Popery.

'Tis also against the ancient practice of Christianity. For the Christians, when they came to have power in their hands, did not punish either Pagans or Jews, with either Sanguinary or Mulctative Laws; nor (for ought that appears) thought it reasonable for them so to do. I confess they did after a while punish *Donatists* with pecuniary penalties, and kept both them and all the rest under divers incapacities; and the same reason they had for so doing, is enough to induce the Church and State of *England* to deal as they do now with Dissenters, and especially with Roman Catholicicks, in keeping them under incapacitating Laws.

If

If it be objected, that those who were so favourably dealt with in those first Christian times, did not communicate with any that were dangerous to the State, as those do who pretend to the like favour amongst us ; and that while they communicate with men of disloyal Principles, it may be thought not unfit to involve them in the same punishment that is due to men of those Principles : It will be answer'd, that they do not communicate with them in any disloyal Doctrine or Practice, and therefore they ought not to be joyn'd with them in the punishment of those Doctrines or Practices. God forbid, that Innocents should be handled as Nocents, for being of the same Communion with them. We should think it very hard and unreasonable, that honest men and good Protestants, who communicate in the Church and Worship of God with such as prove to be Traytors or Felons, must therefore partake with them in suffering for their misdeeds.

If it be farther objected, that among the Roman Catholicks, there are many who are faln off from the Church of *England*, and that such men, at least, deserve punishment for their Apostacy, and much more the Priests or others that wheedled them away : I cannot deny, that in this case we have a just provocation to Severity. And we have an example before us in the Roman Church, which if we should follow, it would go hard with such persons. They which turn from them to us, find no mercy in those Popish Countries where the Inquisition is settled, nor much favour in any other. But we are not bound to follow those examples.

And

And therefore setting them aside, and considering things without Provocation, I must needs say, that the simplicity of most of their Converts, seems to me to deserve rather pity, than any hard punishment. They are generally such as understood not their own Religion, before they suffer'd themselves to be fool'd out of it. Otherwise, if they are learned and knowing men, who thus leave our Communion, which I think rarely happens, and specially if they are Converts to downright Popery; it cannot but argue, that such persons are vehemently lead by their affections, and therefore they may be justly suspected of ill design, and of forming to themselves some interest against the Laws. And if that be true, it cannot be deny'd, that they deserve to suffer all that the Laws have ordain'd for such persons. Yet if men of knowledge and parts, though they have deserted our Church, can content themselves to be Strangers, and not Enemies; and will prove it, by declaring against all the Popes Usurpations, which will be a certain bar to their preferment, and therefore may be a good proof of their sincerity; in this case, I do not see but we may live quietly with them, and perhaps the more safely by their means. What Laws are now in force against them that shall be reconcil'd, or that shall reconcile others, to the Church of *Rome*, were intended to keep men from being poyson'd with Popery; against which those Laws were severe enough, and yet not more than there was cause. And yet according to the wording of those Laws, he is equally to suffer the penalty of them, that draws others,

or that is drawn himself, into the Roman Communion, though not into Popery, as we have defin'd it. I do not know, that those penalties have been inflicted on any one Offender these many years; nor has it been considered, what the Principles were, either of them that were seduced, or of them that seduced them; and 'twere hard, that the impunity of them who have directly transgress'd the intent of those Laws, should be a snare to them that have only transgress'd the letter of them. Therefore, I humbly conceive, that whatsoever Retrospection is made, it ought to be with some kind of Discrimination. And it were to be wish'd for the future, that the old Laws may be put in ure against them that seduce others, or are seduced into Popery; and that some gentler Laws may be made against them that shall enter into that Communion, though they do acquit themselves of those dangerous Principles. But how this may be done, I humbly leave to the wisdom of the State to consider.

The third Reason which I mention'd against an undistinguishing Severity, was this, That it would be against the interest of the Church and State of *England*. Both those great Interests are united together in the preservation of the Monarchy. For Monarchy is essential to the State, as is visible in the Constitution of it. And for the Church of *England*, as she is the best support of the Monarchy, so she is supported by it, and must either fall with it, or be brought into a very low condition; as we have seen by the experience of late years. Now of all sorts and parties among us,
that

that dissent from the Church of *England*, there is none but has Principles which seem to look ill upon Monarchy; nor is there any that has not explain'd the meaning of them by their practices, at one time or other within our memory. To specify this in Instances of all, would be needless; for I know no sort of Dissenters that go about to justify themselves wholly in this matter, except only Roman Catholicks. Among them, some late Writers would bear us down, that they are, and have been always, faithful to the Monarchy. It were better said by others of that Church, than by some of them that have written this. But the truth is, they are a mixt Communion, whereof the governing part of the Clergy are thorough-Papists; and therefore neither they, nor any of their Faction can be right Friends to such a Monarchy as we speak of, whatsoever they pretend. Many of the inferior Clergy, and of the Laity of that Communion are no Papists; as I have shewn in this Paper, and they have shewn it themselves, in adhering to Monarchy against the Pope himself.

Of both these sorts of Roman Catholicks, we have lately seen the tryal in *Ireland*; where for some years they agreed in nothing, but that some times they went to Church together. Their Bishops, and the rest of the chief of their Clergy, were indeed the Pope's Creatures and Subjects. For they had sworn Allegiance to him, and received a Right from him, as well to the Temporalities, as to the Spiritualities of their titular Preferments. What the Pope's meaning was in pre-

fering them, we may guess by what follow'd. For as soon as they saw an opportunity for it; they formed a Rebellion in that Kingdom against the King. And when the Pope sent his Nuncio to head it, they joyn'd with him, and drove the King's Lieutenant out of the Kingdom. Which accursed Rebellion of theirs, lost the King, not only that Kingdom, but the other two Kingdoms, and his life in the end. And yet they of that Faction in *Ireland*, are so far from acknowledging that they did any ill in all this, that within these ten years, the General-Assembly * of the Clergy of that Nation, in plain terms, refus'd to ask His Majesties pardon for any thing that had been done in the late War by any of the Clergy of that Kingdom. This was a sufficient Demonstration of the Prevalence of those Popish Principles among them, and of the ill Influence they have upon Monarchy. Yet there was even then as plain a Demonstration of better Principles in others of that Communion. For some there were, though much fewer in number, who kept their Allegiance to the King throughout that whole Rebellion, and fought for him against the Pope himself, in the person of his Nuncio; and having one while got a great part of the Laity to joyn with them, they prevail'd so far as to drive him out of the Kingdom. But they, and all the rest that serv'd the King in that Nation, were excommunicated for it by the Nuncio and his Clergy in *Ireland*; And that Sentence being judicially ratified at *Rome*, I am assured that many of them do continue under it to this day.

*1666 Jan. 11.
V. Hist. of
Irish Remon-
strance, part 2.
page 671.

In *England* it is to be observ'd in all our Histories, That, even in Popish times, there were those that stood up for the Rights of the Crown against the Pope's Usurpations; and that they which did so, were the generality of the People of this Nation. How else came those Laws of *Provisors*, &c. to pass in Parliament, though the Spiritual Lords oppos'd them with all their might, and protested against them, as oft as such Laws came before them? How came King *Henry VIII* to pass his Law against the Papal Supremacy? which in effect contain'd no more than those former Laws did: And yet the Bishops at that time, not only voted for it, but set their hands to a Book that was writ in defence of it; and some of the most Learned among them, writ besides on that subject as good Discourses as were written in that Age. And how came the whole Kingdom to stand by him (as they did, both before and after the Dissolution of Monasteries) against the Pope's Bull of * Excommunication and Deprivation? which Bull, I conceive was that which first made the Schism. * Dated 1535.
Aug. 30. Though this Breach was made up again by Queen *Mary*, who restor'd the Pope's Authority, to strengthen her own Right to the Crown, which otherwise had hung by the single thred of an Act of Parliament; yet by what pass'd before, it sufficiently appears to have been the judgment of our Forefathers in former Ages, that Popery is no part of the Catholick Doctrine. That it has more obtain'd since, and that the number of Papists has increas'd among the English of that Communion, I partly ascribe to the great offence which was taken

taken at first here in *England* against the Reformation. The Horse is said to have first taken up Man upon his back, to hunt down his Enemy. And for the same end, I conceive, the Roman Catholicks suffer'd the Pope to saddle them in Queen *Mary's* days. They could not have gratified him more, than by letting him ride and hunt together; both which he loves dearly. Soon after, the Pope having by his Council of *Trent*, made Articles of Faith of their controverted Opinions, it could not but oblige them to look kindly on all that he did for himself in that Council. After which, 'tis no wonder that Queen *Elizabeth* found the World so much alter'd since her Father's time. I think 'tis observable, that when He was curs'd and bann'd by the Pope, as She afterwards was, yet he had not one attempt made against his life. Some Rebellions he had against him, but those not so much in the Pope's quarrel, as in the Common People's, who were enrag'd at him for dissolving the Monasteries. But Queen *Elizabeth*, who had little to do of that kind, and who generally pleas'd the People otherwise, and was therefore not so liable to be shockt with Rebellions; yet for all that, when the Pope mark'd her out for destruction, some or other of her Subjects were continually driving practices to take away her life. I mention this as a great Instance of the growth of Popery among the People of that Communion. And yet no doubt she knew those among them that were no Papists; or else she would not have made visits to them, as she did in the most dangerous times; nor have protected their Priests, without sufficient assurance of their Loyalty.

Yet

Yet she had not that way of assurance which K. *James* found out afterwards, and which the Pope himself help'd to make the more satisfactory. For when (as I have said) upon occasion of the *Gunpowder Treason*, K. *James* requir'd the Oath of Allegiance to be taken by all his Subjects; and Pope *Paul V.* requir'd all his Subjects to refuse it: It was easie from thenceforward, among the Roman Catholicks, to know which were the Pope's, and which were the King's Subjects; for each of them would do the will of their Lord, and what they did they maintain'd on both sides. I think there needs no better defence for the Rights of the Crown against the Pope and his Faction, than has been made by one of their Priests, namely, * *Preston*, in his Books for the Oath of Allegiance.

Ibid. an. 1602.
pag. 276.

* He writ his Books in the name of *Widdington*.

Now this being the only Test appointed by Law, and this being already taken by many Roman Catholicks, who profess themselves ready to take any other that the State shall prescribe, for the securing it self against Popery; I conceive that such persons being taken off by this means from all dependance of the Pope, ought in reason to be accounted good Subjects. For if their Principles be such as they swear they are, as well their Principles, as their Oath, will make them firm to the Monarchy. And nothing can be imagin'd to make them against it, or to loosen them from it, but the Pope's Dispensation, against which they secure us as the Law directs them to do. For they both swear expressly, that they will not take any such Dispensation, and that they believe the Pope has

no

no power to give it. I do not say, but while they continue in that Communion, they are continually liable to be tempted and drawn from these Principles: And I know no way the State has to help it, but by making them often renew their Security; as I shall humbly propose in due place. But while they keep to their Principles; which in relation to Monarchy, are the same that the Church of *England* holds; though she ought to desire their Conversion, and to seek it by all lawful means, yet I see not why she should desire to have them driven away, or disabled from assisting her in defence of the Monarchy. Now there is nothing more plain, than that this party of Roman Catholicks must be utterly disabled and destroy'd by an undistinguishing execution of the Laws. For if they have no favour at home, they are sure to find worse abroad. There they must learn to hate their own Country, by suffering for having loved it too well. When they have spent what they can carry over with them, they must want, and may perish ere they find relief. While their zealous Antagonists, the true Sons of the Pope, are received with all kindness wherever they come; and when they have weathered out the storm, they are sure to be sent back with full pockets, and fresh supplies, and such Instructions as may fit the change of times. Then we shall, if it should happen, which God forbid, see the fruit of an undistinguishing Severity. We shall see the destruction of a considerable number of men, that were friends to the Government, and that would have been useful at such a time.

Or .

Or we shall see them return with other Principles, and become Enemies to the Government, which used them as Enemies, and wholly joyn'd in affection to them that fed them in their exile. In few words, we shall see the Popish Faction (truly so call'd) return with more hope to do mischief, and with more power to do it, than ever they had before. They could never yet make all of their Communion to joyn with them in any design against the Government. But then undoubtedly they will, if there be not a sufficient number left of the other side to oppose them.

They at *Rome* are thought to understand their own Interest well. And there is reason they should; for it is the Study of that place. And I suppose, 'tis not in favour to the Church or State of *England*, but for the interest of *Rome*, that they are very well pleas'd with an undistinguishing execution of the Penal Laws in *England* against the Roman Catholicks; and are so far from desiring to have it otherwise, that they hate and detest all distinction, and declare him their Enemy that desires it. This might be proved by more instances than are proper for this place. But I shall give one or two that are sufficient.

And first of former days: *Widdrington*, * a Priest of the Roman Communion, gives this following Relation: 'That *Q. Elizabeth* having discovered, ' that she was minded to shew favour to as many ' Roman Catholick Priests, as should give her assurance of their Loyalty, and to exempt them ' from suffering the penalties of her Laws; some ' well-meaning men went to *Rome* to carry the

The Pope and his party are against the distinguishing of Roman Catholicks.

* Pref. of his Book against *Fitz Herbert* the Jesuite.

'good news, as they thought it. But when they
 'were come thither, they found themselves much
 'mistaken. Instead of thanks, they were reproach'd
 'by the governing party, and branded with the
 'name of Schismatics, Spies, and Rebels to the
 'See Apostolic. And moreover (saith our Author)
 'there *was one of that party* (* F. F.) *compiled a*
 '*Treatise in Italian, to advise his Holiness, That it*
 '*was not good nor profitable to the Catholick Cause,*
 '*that any liberty or toleration should be granted by*
 '*the State of England to Catholicks.*

* Father Fitz
 Herbert.

Secondly, what their judgment is at present concerning this matter, I know not who can inform us better than the Pope's Nuncio's. He that now is, or lately was at *Brussels, Falconieri*, the Internuncio of *Burgundy* and the Low-Countries, I suppose has a power given him over our Roman Catholicks; for his immediate Predecessor *Arroldi* had it, and came over hither in hope to establish his Jurisdiction in *England*. This *Falconieri* was inform'd, while the Parliament were yet sitting, in *March* was twelve month, that divers Roman Catholick Peers had taken the Oath of Allegiance; which provoked him so far, that he lash'd out these words, *It were better there were not a Catholick left in England, than that they should take that Oath to free themselves from Persecution.* This Relation I had from one of that Communion, whom I have very much reason to credit. And yet, if any one doubts of his Testimony, he may see as much written by a Nuncio himself, who was also this man's Predecessor. I think his words go something beyond those of *Falconieri*, unless they like the
 the

the Oath of Allegiance better than the Irish Remonstrance ; which whosoever compares them, will judge they cannot well do, according to their Principles. And yet of that Remonstrance it was, that the former Nuncio *Vecchii* gave his judgment in these words, *It may do more hurt and mischief to the Church of God (viz. to the Popish Faction in it) than any Persecution that ever was from the Hereticks.* I doubt not, the late Pope's Nuncio, that waged war in *Ireland* against our late King, if he had lived to these times, would have been of the same mind. He would have endeavoured to keep his party together, and not let them be separated by a Test. He would have told them, they were as good have ask'd Pardon for what they had done, as Promised to do so no more ; which promise in fewer words was the effect of that Remonstrance. By these Indications, we may guess at that which might otherwise have been a mystery to us, namely, why so many Leading-men of that Communion in *England*, who refuse to take the Oath of Allegiance, are so much against the framing of any other Test. It might seem very strange, that they who are so loud, above all others, in crying out of Persecution, are yet so extremely averse from doing that which is the only sure way to avoid it ; namely, from giving publick Security to the State. But their meaning is plain. They would not have Popery garbled out of their Religion ; nor those Principles forsworn, that may be useful when time serves. If 'twere known who are the Pope's, and who are the King's Subjects, it were to be feared the Pope's would be left single ;

Hist. of the
Irish Remons.
Part 1. p. 515.

and that they themselves would be found to be of that number. I cannot blame them, that they had much rather keep themselves in the Herd; and therefore perswade all men of their Church, rather to run the hazard of a general undistinguishing Persecution, than to submit to such a Test, as may enable the State to know its Enemies.

Two ways
useful to the
Pope's design
against Eng-
land.

It is plain, that He whom they serve, may despair of arriving at his ends upon *England*, any otherwise than by one of these two ways; viz. Either by an undistinguishing execution of the Laws against all Roman Catholicks in general; or by an undistinguishing Toleration to them all; and for their sakes, to all other Dissenters whatsoever.

[An undistin-
guishing exe-
cution of the
Laws again st
Popery.

By the former way, Popery, (properly so called) would be kept from appearing in the Light, which it does not love. It would pass undiscovered, in the Croud, among Principles of Religion. And the people, by little and little, would come to be perswaded, that they ought to suffer as much for their Obedience to the Pope, as for their belief in God. Than which there is no one thing that our *Hildebrandists* drive at with more zeal; and no doubt the Pope would buy it with all his heart, at the hazard of leaving not one Roman Catholick in *England*. Though the hazard would not be so great to them, that should be his prime Agents in this business. For they would be sure to keep themselves out of harms way. And all the danger should light on Bigots, and such hot-headed men; who, though living, they
are

are worth nothing ; yet, when they dye, leave Treasures to the Church. For they must presently be cryed up for Martyrs. And then, What can be said enough to the glory of the Apostles that sent them forth, and of the Apostolick See, and of Christ's Vicar that sits in it? Happy men, that are sure to have their Bodies work Miracles, wheresoever their Souls be! And Blessed Cause for which such Men did not stick to sacrifice their lives!

If there happens a Leading-man, a *Garnet* to be taken among them, there is a loss indeed, for which perhaps the *straw* makes not a sufficient recompence. Yet this loss falls on Persons only, and not on the Cause. The Tenets, which do all the mischief, not only escape, but gain ground. If they were *not de Fide* before, now they are, being seal'd with the blood of Martyrs, and attested with Miracles. And this Faith is not like to want Preachers worthy of it self. For there will be always men enough left of the worse sort: The most subtle and dangerous, will save themselves one way or other. They'll be sure to get out of the way, till they see their own time to shew themselves; And then they will appear the more Venerable to the party, as being the Brethren and Successors of them that died for their Religion.

By the other way of undistinguishing Toleration, they would have divers advantages, more than I shall mention in this place. For it is not my business here to write against Toleration, but rather against an undistinguishing Execution of Laws. But
 . that

that I may not seem by this means, to desire to perswade a Toleration, which I take to be much worse than the other, I shall shew the danger of it in these following particulars:

Toleration is
a way to de-
stroy the esta-
blish'd Reli-
gion.

For first, they look upon Toleration as a sure way to destroy the establish'd Religion. And therefore in all Countries where Popery is establish'd, they are so far from admitting any Toleration, that they look upon him that speaks for it as their Enemy, and count none their sure Friends, but them that set up the Inquisition. By which also here in *England*, if *England* were theirs, they would make a short work with all those other Dissenters, whom now they seem to look upon with compassion, and to plead against Persecution, and wish Liberty of Conscience, for their sakes. They would not have the Thorn be disturb'd, while it is in their Enemies sides; but, if it were out, they would burn it, for fear it should be a Thorn in their own.

Toleration
would weaken
the Civil Go-
vernment.

Another use of Toleration among us, would be to weaken the Government; as needs it must, if the strength of the Government consists in the hearts of the Subjects. A most unjust and wickedly manag'd jealousy of our late blessed King's inclination to Popery, first lost him the hearts of his People. Which jealousy being confirm'd, by his granting (as it was said) a Toleration of Popery in *Ireland*, they grew wild upon it, and would never come at him more. Or if they would, it was too late, when his Enemies had gotten him in their hands. I think 'tis visible now, that as well as all parties among us love Liberty,

betty, there is none of them with it to Roman Catholics; unless it be with design to blow up the like jealousy again. God forbid there should be any such design now on foot. But if there be, they that drive it, are not altogether Fools. They have reason to think, that if the Government were away, they might be able to make their party good against the Roman Catholics. Nor can our Papists be such fools, to imagine, that they alone can make head against the other Dissenters. It is possible they may hope, that if it should come to that, the men of our Church would joyn with them. But that will never be, unless they get the Government of their side. Which they very ill deserve, if they ask a Toleration, before they have converted, at least, half the Kingdom. And this they would consider, if it were any part of their care to preserve the Government of the Nation. But there is but one Government in the World, for which thorough-Papists are concern'd. All the rest are to be brought under this; and those that will not bend to it, must be broken. It matters not into what Form they are reduced, whether of Kingdom, or Free-States, or Common-wealth. Much less are those of *Hildebrand's* Sect concern'd for this or that Family. A *Cromwel* would have serv'd their turn (when time was) as well as a *Stuart*. For, I suppose they that courted him to be the *Restorer of the Catholick Religion*, would not have dealt so courtly with him, as to turn him out for his pains. But that which makes their teeth ache against the present Government, is, to see it united with

V. Dr. Baileys
Life of B. F.
Shew, about the
end of it.

with the Church of *England*. Which Church being likely enough to be destroy'd by a Toleration, if the same means will embroyl the Kingdom too, they will like it never the worse. The old Fisherman whom they serve, fishes best in troubled waters. He never made such a draught here in *England*, as he did in the late times of Confusion. And then also in *Ireland*, he had almost a whole Kingdom in his Net; though for want of strength, he could not draw it ashore.

A Toleration
would increase
the number
of Papists.

But in case a Toleration should not have that most desirable effect, of blowing up a Civil War, nor any other way weaken the Government (which to me seems impossible;) yet at least there would be hope, that it might some way strengthen the party. If they could but have the face, which they seldom want, and that colour withal, which this would give them, to say, that this Liberty was granted in favour to Popery, and that this favour was an earnest of more, and that now all would be theirs very speedily, no doubt many would believe them. And not a few by the power of this belief, would be drawn to join with them; and to be the more welcome, would present them, as well with their Loyalty as with their Religion.

It would also be a means to wear off the strangeness between them and the other Sects. For, those who were content to enjoy Toleration with them, though with design to try it out, who should be Masters at last, when they had trod down the Church of *England* between them; yet would have

have some conversation with them the mean while. And I suppose, a cunning Jesuite would be able now and then to convince a simple Sectary. Howsoever that might succeed; they would be united together, in one common Interest, though with different designs. They would both be concern'd to keep up the Toleration. They would engage together against the Enemies of it. And there insensibly grows a kindness between men that sail in the same ship together, though they are bound for different Ports.

But although this good effect may be procur'd by a general suspension, or, rather a Repeal of the Penal Laws; yet if that cannot be had, the same will follow in some measure upon an undistinguishing execution of them. And therefore, if there be no remedy but that they must be executed, it is the interest of the Popish Faction, to have them felt by as many as is possible. Perhaps it were for their turn to have them fear'd rather than felt. For the smart of the Rod would cure many of their distempers, that are enrag'd by having it shaken over them. But either the threatening of the Law, or a light execution of it, being extended to all, would suffice to do their business. And if that Severity, which were a means to cure many, would exasperate all the rest, I conceive that would do it much better. For all other Dissenters being brought under the Lash as well as Roman Catholicks, no doubt would be as much dissatisfied with the Government and Laws. They would joyn with them in aspersing the State with injustice and cruelty. They would add to
I their

their noise, by crying out of Persecution for Conscience. And all men loving naturally to be pitied, they that study popular Arts, can easily find how to take men by this handle, and to draw them nearer themselves, and to make a mischievous use of them. I know I do not teach them, by saying, that such Accidents may arise, in which 'twere very possible for the Jesuites to make such a conjunction with some of our Fanaticks, as might create no small trouble and danger to Church and State.

But if other Dissenters are not yet angry enough with the Government; or if they know the Jesuits so well that they will not deal with them, or if they will give nothing for the privilege of being eaten last (for any of these things may very well happen) then these Gentlemen have none left to work upon but Roman Catholicks. And of them they have all reason to be secure, unless they are very loyally principled. The only way to work on such, is, by drawing them off from their Principles. And that they may hope to do, when they find them uneasy, and out of humour. As it cannot be expected but they will be, if they are made to suffer the Severity of the Laws. They that have been faithful to the Government, and know themselves to intend no other, and are ready to give any proof of it; yet to see themselves ruin'd by the Government, or to be kept in continual fear of it, must needs be discompos'd, and think themselves very hardly dealt with. Then, if a Jesuite step in, and endeavour to convince him, that all their suffering

ing is for Religion ; and not for treasonable Principles ; if he instance in that Loyal Person himself, and bids him *judge by his own experience, he cannot but feel himself suffer ; he knows himself free from disloyalty, therefore his suffering can be for nothing else but his Religion* : He must be a man of more than ordinary Abstraction, that can discern the fallacy of this reasoning. And he that cannot find that, had need stop his ears, with a resolution to hear nothing against the Government, or else the Jesuite will be too hard for him. He had need be as resolute in his Loyalty, as in his Religion. For the proof being made, as well to his Sense, as to his Reason, it looks like an Argument against *Transubstantiation*. If the person so attack'd be a very *Job* in holding his integrity ; if no Argument will move him, nor no other temptation draw him from it : Yet he must yield to Wart, which can neither be hid nor resisted. There are many good men that live from hand to mouth, and that hardly enough, while they enjoy their Estates. If any of these be deprived of so much as the Law would take from him, he cannot live with that which he has left. And then if a Pension be offer'd him out of the Jesuites Bank, or out of the Pope's Coffers, he will scarce know how to refuse it. Necessity will make a generous man do that, which he would hate to think of in better circumstances. And having eaten their bread, he will find it a hard matter to keep himself disengag'd from their Interests. Much more, if he suffer himself once to be engag'd, he will find it impossible to untwist himself after-

wards. And 'tis next to impossible, for him that has been oblig'd by their benefits, and as it were, list'd in Service, and taken pay on the Enemies side, to have any kindness left for his Country, that drove him to all this. I know but one instance, that of *David in Gath*, of a man that was put to all these streights, and yet not corrupted in his Principles.

I shew but one way of many, how men that are very good Subjects, and desire nothing more than to continue so, may be spoil'd with hard usage, and made Enemies against their Inclinations. Which, being added to those things said before on this head, may be more than enough to make good my third Reason, against an undistinguishing execution of the Laws on Roman Catholics; as being against the interest of the Church and State of *England*.

And this seems so evident to me, that I have no manner of doubt, that as the best news we could send to *Rome*, would be of a general Toleration of all Religions and Sects whatsoever; so, next to that (which I know would please them best) the most welcome news would be, to assure them, that all the Laws here in *England* against Roman Catholics, were severely and indifferently put in execution. And I am as sure, that nothing would trouble them more, than to hear of such a Discrimination or Distinction of Roman Catholics, as I come now to propound.

The true way
to suppress
Popery, is by
Severity to
Papists, and
Clemency to
other Roman
Catholics.

For, now to speak on the Affirmative side of the Debate, this seems to be the only way for suppressing of Popery, if the State will be pleas'd to distinguish

distinguish between Papists and other Roman-Catholicks: and so to shew favour to the one, upon security given of their Loyalty; as that the other, who will not give that security, may have no part of that favour, but be left to the severity of all those Laws that have been, or shall be made against their Principles and Practices.

My Reasons are, 1. Because this course being taken, would be effectual to the end above-mentioned. 2. It would be equitable in it self. 3. And it would be for the interest of the Church and State of *England*. I shew'd before, that the undistinguishing way had not any of those three properties or qualities. Now the way which I propound being contrary to it, must have all the three by the Rule of Contraries; and I conceive I need no other proof. But to make the matter more plain, I shall resume these three Reasons, and prove them severally in the order propos'd.

1. This course would be Effectual. For it would take away the causes of Popery. The only immediate causes, which have either propagated or preserved Popery so long in this Kingdom, notwithstanding all Laws that have been made against it, as well anciently as of late times, are chiefly these two. On one side, the great boldness and business of the truly Popish Clergy, in asserting and crying up all Papal pretences whatsoever. On the other side, the tameness of the other Clergy of that Communion, or whatsoever else their fault is, and has been, in not opposing those Papal pretences. For the former of these, I think 'tis very
visible.

visible in all the *Jesuites* that come among us, and in most of the other *Regular Orders*, and not a few of the *Seculars*; that their chief business amongst us, is to advance the Pope's Authority in all things, and to reduce all men under the obedience of it. 'Tis true, they have not yet seen their time to attempt this by open War. They have not set up the holy Banner in *England*, and plac'd the Pope's Nuncio in the head of an Army against the King; as their Brethren did in *Ireland*, and do not repent of it. But neither will our Popish Clergy say, that those in *Ireland* did ill in it. They have neither declared their dislike of that Rebellion by any publick act: Nor among all the Books they have writ since the King's Restauration, has any one of their Writers writ so much as one line against it, that ever I could see or hear of. But their Books abound with those principles out of which that Rebellion was hatch'd. They are slyly insinuated in those which are to be had at every Stall. And there are those that pass from hand to hand, in which this Treason is the main scope of their writing. By which we may guess what wholesome Doctrine it is that they infuse upon occasion in private, when they are among their own people. What kind of preaching and catechising they use. What information of their Penitents. What ghostly counsel they give; and what loyal directions of Conscience. And if we had nothing else to discover them to us, we may soon find what kind of spiritual Offices they perform, by the Fruit of them, in the perverseness and obstinacy of so many of their Laity, who choose to do or endure any

any thing, rather than take the Oath of Allegiance.

I deny not, that there are other Priests of that Communion, who, as far as we can judge by their private discourse, seem to be rightly principled, and well inclined towards the Civil Government. There are those that seem to be heartily for the Independency of the Crown of *England*; and that hold, that the external Government of the Church ought to be in the King, in such manner as the Laws of the Land do or shall prescribe; and who are firmly perswaded, that the contrary Positions of Popery are as bad as they are declared to be in the Oath of Allegiance. And some of them have declared this very honestly and publickly in their Writings, both heretofore and of late days. I think I should do them no service in naming them. For as things now are, it would only provoke and enable those of the former sort to do them mischief. Which we see, they are prone enough to do, by their traducing them publickly, though Priests of the same Church; and branding them with the Characters of Schism, Heresie, Apostacy, &c. and thereby setting the people of their Communion against them. But whereas those honest men of that Communion tell us, that there are many more of their Principles among the Secular Clergy, and also among the Regulars of inferior rank and condition: I cannot but say, that if they are not mistaken, there is a great fault among them on the other hand. Those many good men, of whom they tell us, are much to blame, that they do not declare against the Pope's

Pope's Usurpation; but rather strengthen it by their sinful compliance and silence. Either they do not think it so bad as they pretend; or else what Wretches are they to juggle with the Consciences of their People? How can they answer it to God, from whom they pretend to have these Souls given them in charge, that they do not warn them of so dangerous a sin, that has slain its thousands and ten thousands in our streets? Why do they suffer so great a scandal to lye upon their Church, and such a danger to hang over the Civil State, while they that are the Spiritual Watchmen see it, and yet hold their peace? Nay, worse than so, the Dog fawns upon the Wolf. These honest men, if they may yet be so called, hold very good quarter and fellowship with those, whom they know to be Zealots for Popery. They make their Court to them, of whom they cannot be ignorant that both their Principles and their Interest lead them to it; that is in effect, they are so officious to stand by and hold the horses of them that are committing a Robbery; or worse employ'd, in doing all those evils above-mentioned.

I cannot see how they can excuse this any other-wise, than by alledging, That all their Compliance is for fear of being ruin'd, and imprison'd, and starv'd, as some of their Brethren have been, for doing their duty; and more are like to be, if some course be not taken to protect them against the rage of their implacable Enemies.

Not to judge of the sufficiency of this excuse, I confess there is reason for what they say. For 'tis visible what became of those Church-men
of

of their Communion, who have given the highest Test of their Loyalty, who have scorn'd all those servile Compliances, and who have declared against Popery by their Actions and Writings. 'Tis the easier to observe this, because there have been so few of them, I think not above two or three in an Age. They have been fain to stand the mark of a violent endless Persecution, both from the Court of *Rome*, and from all its Faction in *England*. And, however it came to pass, they did not find that countenance, which they might have expected from the State, in defence of whose Rights they drew all that wrath upon themselves. We have a great example of this in *Preston*, who having both taken the Oath of *Allegiance* himself, and maintain'd it against all the great Champions of Popery, was fain to take Sanctuary in the *Clink*, and glad to hide his head there for many years before he died. Another Learned man, *Dr. Barnes*, the famous Author of *Romano-Catholicus Pacificus*, had not leave to choose a Prison to dye in. For he was spirited by the Pope's Emislarics, and carried away to *Rome*, and thrown into the *Inquisition* there. What became of him since, we shall know at the day of Judgment.

If these be their ways to maintain, and to propagate Popery, we cannot be to seek for our way to suppress it. For it is manifest, that this cannot be more effectually done, than by such a Discrimination as has been propounded.

On the one hand it would be a means to preserve those few men of that Communion among us, who have already declared against the *Popes Usurpations*.

K

And

And the same course that should be taken to keep them out of danger, would also be a means to free all other men of their Principles, from the fear under which they have been kept so many years.

Whether at this present they have more or less cause to apprehend the Popish Faction, they will be the better able to judge, when they see what is done in Monsieur *Luzance's* case. For as there is no reason to doubt, that those Gentlemen, if they find they may do what they please, will do no less to those of their own Communion, that oppose their grand design, than they attempted on him that had deserted their Communion: So, if the State shall think fit to check their audacious Insolence in this case, by some exemplary punishment, though I doubt they will not forsake the Land upon it, yet it is to be hoped, that they will upon some other Act of State, to which this may be a very good Introduction. Sure enough, if the Laws were duly executed on all those that will not give sufficient Security to the State, we should soon be rid of all, or most part of their Company. And then it would be a time for better men to shew themselves. Those that did give Security, would be obliged in their own defence, if no otherwise, to own the Principles by which they were warranted to give it. Besides, it would be as well their interest, as their duty, to disabuse that great part of the Laity whom those *Hildebrandists* had seduced with lies these fourscore years. It would concern them to possess themselves as well of their Consciences, as of their Chappels;

Chappels; and therefore to make them see, how vast a distance there is between that Faith which had been chiefly inculcated into them (I mean, the properly Popish Faith) and the Primitive Christian; and to convince them what a cursed Immorality they have been taught all this while, under the name of Obedience to the Church; and to shew them, that the way which their former Guides have conspired to mislead by the glorious name of Holy Martyrdom, is the down-right way to Hell.

Having thus declar'd that most necessary Truth, to which both their Interest and Conscience led them; the same Reasons would oblige them to love home, and to study the Peace of their Country. They would have little business at *Rome*; and that would be so ill done there, that they would not be encourag'd to send thither again.

On the other hand, of the Pope's Faction in *England*, if the Laws were so executed, as I have said, none could remain here but only Hypocrites and Equivocators. And their stay would be very uncomfortable, if they kept silence; but worse, if they discovered themselves, for then they must expect to suffer the Severity of the Laws. They must either hang like bare-fac'd Traytors, without any pretence of the Crown of Martyrdom; or they must take it for a favour, that they may have leave to go after their Fellows. And they that are once out of the Kingdom, will have no hope to come in again. To be sure they shall not, if the Priests of their own Church can keep them out, or can discover them lurking in it. Nor, I

suppose, will any of the Laity be very forward to harbour them. We have no reason to think, that any man should be so unreasonable, to venture neck or purse, for the Reception of them for whom his Soul is not concern'd, when he might without danger, or any apprehension of it, enjoy the exercise of his Religion; when he might have all the Offices of it performed by other Priests, as Canonical in their Mission, and as exemplary in their lives; men free from exception every way, save that they have no tincture of *Hildebrand's* Doctrine. If that be it that makes them so in love with a Jesuite, that nothing seems sacred that comes out of any other hand, the State has just cause to suspect from whence that niceness proceeds, and to treat them as those that hold correspondence with its Enemies. Nor can they in this case have any colour to pretend, that they suffer for their Religion, who might have enjoy'd their Religion, without mingling it with that Treason for which they suffer. And however the matter may be thought of by Him at *Rome*, whose judgment we ought not to value in this case, I believe no Foreign Prince will think this a Persecution of Roman-Catholicks. *France* thought it none, when time was, to banish the Jesuites. Nor *Venice* to turn out three Orders together, which were all that submitted to the Pope's Interdict and Excommunication. There is no reason to doubt, that any other State of that Communion would have done the like, upon as great an occasion. So that if any of those States should interpose in favour of those against whom the
State

State of *England* has so just an exception, it might seem as if they did not so much desire to have them taken in here, as to rid their own Country of such Vermin, as they would not be willing to harbour. They have reason to apprehend, that those that we send over to them, would teach their own people to do like them, and put the Authority there to the trouble of doing the same thing that ours have done here, and which themselves have been fain to do in former times.

I say not but any Prince that were in hostility, or that thought himself likely ere long to break with *England*, might be ready to receive this sort of men, as he would do other Spies and Traytors to their Country. There were very great Reason, that a Prince in those circumstances should consider these men, as being most completely qualified for all such purposes. And because the Pope is a sure Enemy to all them that are for the suppressing of Popery, I doubt not, they would find him ready to mingle his quarrels with theirs, and his Instruments would work much the better, when they received their impulse from his hand. But all this would last no longer than until those Princes thought it their best way to be at peace with us. And that would soon be, if we were at Unity among our selves: As we should be, if none were suffered to live among us, but such as might live in an easie, or very tolerable condition. Then those Princes would soon ease themselves of the burthen, and give the Pope leave to find some other way to keep his Vermin. Which after a while, he would do with
such :

such Italian Frugality, that if their Rents were stop'd here in *England*, they would soon look as thin as *Fauxes* Lanthorn; or to describe them to the life, they would be like *Envy* in the Poet.

I need not trouble the Reader, with minding him, That in case of such a Discrimination, there could be no danger of the increase either of Priests or Seminaries abroad, and as little danger of any Commiseration or Pity at home, to hinder it from being effectual. It is obvious to every apprehension, that the removal of these dangers would be one of the necessary consequences of it. For who does not see, that if the Roman Catholicks, on such terms as I have describ'd, might enjoy their Religion, and their Estates, and their liberty, they would not count them their Friends that would perswade them to throw away that enjoyment. Doubtless, if some few did not know when they were well, the generality of them would understand it. And both they of their own Church, and much more the Protestants, would think them not to be pitied, that should lose what they had thrown away with their own hands, especially when they considered, for what end these men did it; that it was out of a restless desire to bring a Foreign Tyrannical Yoke upon their Country.

Therefore, since by this, and what else has been said on this head, we cannot but see; That the only immediate causes, not only of the Propagation, but Preservation of Popery in this Kingdom; (*viz.* the great business and boldness of them of the Popish Faction, and the great tameness and fearfulness

fearfulness of the other Clergy of that Communion among us) would be quite removed by such a Discrimination of Roman Catholicks : We cannot but conclude with the same evidence, That such a Discrimination would be effectual to suppress Popery in this Kingdom. For nothing can be more clear in Natural Reason then that, where-soever the only immediate causes both of the Propagation and Conservation of any thing ceases, there that thing it self must cease to be. And after all that has been said already, we cannot rationally doubt, whether by such a Discrimination, those only immediate causes of the Preservation and Propagation of Popery would cease to be any longer in *England*. 'Tis manifest to every considering man, That in case of such a Discriminating Course, duly and constantly held, the busie Agents for Popery, must either give up their Cause, or fly their Country. And either way will do our business. If any of them stay, they will do their part toward it, by giving security to the State. Which cannot be without the renouncing of Popery. If they all go, it will be a blessed rid-dance of them and Popery together. For the active part or soul of it will depart with the Jesuites. And the Body or Scheme of Doctrines will be interr'd by those whom they leave behind them, or rather hang'd up, for it does not deserve Christian Burial.

2. Such a Discrimination would also be just and equitable. For it would be according to the intention of the Laws of this Kingdom, and most agreeable to the eternal Law of Reason,

son, and the ancient practice of the Christian World.

By all these Rules I have shewn, that it is not just nor equitable, that the penalties of the Laws, as now they are, should be inflicted on all Roman Catholicks indifferently, without any respect of Loyal or Disloyal. And in proving this, I have sufficiently shewn, (For it follows by the Rule of Contraries above-mention'd,) That it is both just and equitable, that all of that Religion, who being faulty in nothing else, shall give such assurance of their Loyalty, as the State shall think fit to require, should enjoy an exemption from those penalties, which were never intended for such persons. But of this more shall be spoken in due place.

For them, on the other hand, who refuse to give such an assurance, and by their obstinacy therein, would keep the State in perpetual jealousy, and expose it to the danger of unknown Enemies, who cannot be known from good Subjects, but by such a way of distinction as they endeavour to obstruct: I conceive 'tis just and equitable, that the State should look upon them either as Enemies, or at least, as the Concealers of Enemies.

If they are only Concealers of such Enemies as our Papalins are, it is just that they should suffer for it in the same degree as they transgress against the Law, and as they hinder the security of the State. And it is no small transgression in them, that not only disobey the Law, but (as far as in them lies) make many Laws utterly useless. For those Laws being provided for the security of the State

State against a Sect, or rather Faction of men, who are dangerous in the highest degree, and for whom the Law has therefore procured the highest punishment; it is certainly a great presumption of those, who in spight, and as it were in defiance of the Law, will keep them not only from being punished, but from being so much as distinguished.

Now it is evident that the Papalins are such a Faction, whose Principles lead them, when they see their opportunity, to subvert the present Government and Laws both of the Church and Kingdom of *England*. It is certain that in pursuance of these Principles, they have attempted to do all this more than once within these last hundred years. And this in favour to the pretences of a Foreigner, who has more than one dormant Title to the Sovereignty of *England*, who actually invaded *Ireland* in Queen *Elizabeth's* days, and usurpt the Royal Power there by his Nuncio in our Age; who assumes to himself in some cases (whereof he makes himself the only Judge) a right to dispose of all States and Kingdoms whatsoever. If therefore any State may justly endeavour to preserve it self against a Foreign Enemy, and may make Laws to restrain their own people from joining with them, and may punish with death or otherwise, as many as shall presume to break those Laws; *England* has all this right within it self, as well as any other State, and may use it as well against the Pope as against any other Enemy. And therefore the State may require all its Subjects to declare against his Usurpation, and to renounce all those Principles that are any way favourable to it. If any of

L

them

them shall refuse to do this, the State may justly punish them, whether with death or otherwise, according to its Laws; which in this point are enacted with the highest reason, and backt with all other Laws, Divine and Humane, &c. with the practice not only of other Christian States, but of all other Nations in the world.

I know the Refusers will be ready to say, their Conscience will not suffer them to declare against that Power which the Pope assumes to himself, nor to renounce those ill Principles which they say are a part of their Religion. No doubt they that are through-Papists have great reason to say this. For Popery, as I have shewn, does consist of such Principles, which though, as to the matter of them, they are truly Secular and Political, yet go veiled under the sacred name of Religion. They whose interest it is to have them believed, are pleased to make them Articles of the Catholick Faith. And no doubt it takes with many. For we see there are those that do not stick to sacrifice their lives for those Principles. And what can be dearer to men than their Lives, but Religion? We see they do not spare the lives of men of opposite Principles, against whom they profess to have no other Quarrel but Religion. And we have reason to believe them; for 'tis what our Saviour said, *When they kill you, they shall think they are doing God service.*

John 16. 2.

But what Religion is that, which teaches men to do things which are so evidently against the light of Nature, as Murder; especially when joyned with Rebellion, and acted upon the persons of their

their own Princes, and tending to the dissolution of humane Society and destruction of mankind? Whatsoever Religion this be, sure enough 'tis not Christian, nor such as ought to be allow'd among Christians. And therefore if their Conscience binds them not to renounce it, so does the Magistrates Conscience bind him to punish them for it. 'Tis the duty of him that bears the Sword to punish all Immorality, though never so lawful or necessary in the judgment of him that commits it. If a Jew or a Turk come to live in this Kingdom, and marry many Wives, which he may safely do by his Law, 'tis just by our Law to hang him for it. Much more if one be guilty of such immorality as tends immediately to the subversion of the Kingdom, it is both just and necessary to send him away, or not let him live in it but at his peril. And if he complain that this is persecution for Conscience, (which by the way cannot but sound very oddly from one of that Sect, that burn men only for Conscience) his complaint in this case would be very unreasonable: And we ought to be no more moved with it, than we should be, if he complain'd that we would not stand still, and have our throats cut, in compliance with his Conscience.

There is nothing that can secure State or People against this Religious Distemper of the fiery Papalins, and that can also preserve the Civil Rights and Proprieties of good Subjects of that Communion, but only such a discrimination between them as may distinguish the Loyal from the Disloyal, the Turbulent from the Peaceable, in such manner that they both may have what they deserve.

serve. This is in effect to render to every one his due, according to Law and Reason: Which is the very definition of Justice and Equity. For the administration whereof God has ordain'd the Civil Power, and put the Sword into the Magistrates hand, to employ it, (as the Apostle says) *to the praise of them that do well, and for the terror of evil doers.*

1 Pet. 2. 14.

By what has been said on this last Head, it sufficiently appears, that such a discrimination is also for the Interest of the Church and State of *England*. For that Interest is preserv'd by Justice and Equity; which will entitle it to that blessing from God which he hath promis'd in his Word, and which are naturally apt to be instrumental to the Divine Providence in producing that good which he has promised. For a just distribution of Rewards and Punishments makes the Government venerable in the eyes of the people, and secures it at home by their chearful obedience. It also acquires that Reputation abroad which will make it either loved or feared by all the neighbour Nations. Our Neighbours of the Roman Communion who are now possess'd by the clamours of those among us, that say they are persecuted for Religion, and who can judge no otherwise when they see men severely handled that are criminal no other way, will be soon disabused by such a discrimination. And it will right us to those Protestants abroad, to whom the State has been ill represented by some on the other hand, for not executing all the Penal Laws against Popery. It will save *England* the trouble of making Apologies either way, to vindicate the
Justice

Prov. 14. 34.

Justice of its proceedings to other Nations. For it is manifest, that no Government can tolerate such as hold Tenets inconsistent with its own safety ; nor on the contrary , deny the protection of the Laws to men whose Principle it is to obey the Government , and to do all that in them lies to support it : To venture their lives in defence of the Authority, not only of the Legislators, but of those very Laws which they make against them, till those Laws are repeal'd by the same power by which they were made.

It were easie to bring hither all those reasons with which I shewed before, that undistinguishing Laws and execution of Laws are against the Interest of the Church and State of *England* ; and to prove by the same reasons , that nothing of this kind can be more for it than such a Discrimination as is here propounded. For if it be for the Interest of *England* to support and strengthen the Government, then it is not to weaken the Friends of the Government, nor to strengthen or preserve the Enemies of it. I shew'd that such would be the effect of an undistinguishing way ; which is therefore desired by them of the Popish Faction , as being next to a Toleration the most likely means to unite and to encrease their party among us. Now taking those things for granted which are already proved, it follows that, upon the account of Interest, this way of Discrimination should be as desirable to us as 'tis hateful and detestable to them. Sure enough they apprehend it , and not without visible cause, to be the likeliest way both to stop

the further growth, of Popery , and to lessen the number of Papists among us.

I may add (which is visible in the nature of the thing) that a Discrimination between them that are of the same Communion will be a sure way to divide them among themselves. Which may be a means to do some of them the greatest spiritual good, or at least to keep us from taking that hurt which we have reason to fear from so numerous and powerful a Combination against us.

For the way of Distinction between Papists and other Roman Catholicks must be by some test or mark of Distinction. And that either by the passing of some new Law for it , especially when there is a new mark of Distinction, or by the strict execution of those Laws that are in force for the taking of any Test that is already made. In either of these Cases, the Papalins (who are men of intelligence) will take an early alarm, and try their Friends here in *England*, if they can to prevent the passing of any such Law, or the execution of any that is past. If their Friends fail them here, their next resort is to *Rome* , where they have an old Friend that never fails them. The Pope , if he has not forgotten the old trick, sends out his Censures against all that shall submit to those Laws, and take the Test which is prescribed in them. If it be no more than the Oath of Allegiance, that is forbidden already by divers Popes, and condemned by them as having many things in it which are contrary to the Catholic Faith. And the reason of this severity is, as well to guard their own Temporal Power, as to keep their Creatures and Friends from

from discovery. If any here, and especially if any Priests of that Communion, are so bold, notwithstanding all this to take the Test; then upon the next information, or soon after, the Pope sends to tell noses. And if he finds they are but few that transgress (which will scarce be in our case) he delays not to cite them to *Rome*, and if they come thither, woe be to them; if not, he curses them afresh, and particularly. But if they are many, he considers their strength, and being Curse-proof, he forbears them for the present, only leaving them under his general Censures. Otherwise, if they are a weak and obnoxious multitude, he proceeds to further Censures against them. And if some few have been more forward than the rest in doing that which the Law requires, and specially if any dares justify what they have done, he denounces them Excommunicate by name, and therein both sacrifices them to his own angry Deity, and gives his discovered Creatures some kind of revenge on those poor men, to ease their hearts, till he and they can find how to be reveng'd on the State, for which they are to wait their opportunity.

it

When any of these things happens, as it has done in like cases, and as it will do in these above-mentioned, if Popes are constant to themselves: (For there is nothing here said but what I could prove both by Rule and Example) we have reason to hope that some of those censur'd men, who are able to right themselves, or rather their Religion, will do it, by declaring against the horrible injury that is done both to it and them. And specially

specially their Priests, who have hitherto alledg'd, that the reason they have not done it all this while, has been their continual fear of a Proclamation to send them beyond Sea, where they are sure to be call'd to a severe account for whatsoever they have said or done against the Interest of *Rome*. When that fear is over, as it will be upon their giving security to the State, it may justly be expected, that they will both speak and write their minds freely, as occasion shall be offered, for the instruction of their people, and for the Vindication of themselves and their Religion. If the general Censures be objected, as it is certain they will, by those that procur'd them, they will be oblig'd to shew the injustice and the invalidity of those Censures. If they are Excommunicated by name for so doing, they will be further engag'd to consider the Authority of him that lays about him so madly with the Keys of the Church. It was so in *Luther's* Case, The quarrel begun between him and the Procurers of the Pope's Bulls. It proceeded from them to their Patrons in the Court of *Rome*. And so at last it came up to the Papal Authority it self. Who knows but that it may please God (for *Vexatio dat intellectum*) that many among us being vext with Declarations, that are certainly uncanonical, may be brought by that means to discover, that the Power which sent them forth is Antichristian ?

Ma. 28. 15.

The most difficult thing that is required toward the making this discovery, is only to lay aside those strong prejudices which men commonly receive from their Education, and from converse with
men

men and things of that Age in which they live.

He that laying aside these shall look impartially into the Scriptures, and into the undoubted Records of the Primitive Church, shall find no Foundation for that prodigious Fabrick of the Papacy. For the first three hundred years after Christ, they will find only two, namely *Victor* and *Stephen*, that took upon them to censure any which were not of their Diocess. And though their Censures (for ought that appears) were only Declarations of Non-Communion, such as any Bishop in those days might send forth against the Bishop of *Rome*, as well as he against other Bishops; yet we find that, even for that, they were blamed and condemned by other Bishops. And that is all the effect that we read their Censures had in any place out of *Rome* it self. Pope *Victor* in his Censure of the *Asian* Bishops, is thought not to have gone beyond threatening, to break Communion with them, and endeavouring to persuade other Bishops to do the same. And yet for this he was smartly handled by some of the *Brethren*: and it is charitably thought he was set right by the grave Counsel of *Irenæus*, who writ to him in the name of the *Gallican* Church, and told him he did not learn this of any of his Predecessors. Of Pope *Stephen* it is certain that he went farther in his Quarrel with the *Asian* and *African* Bishops. For he not only broke off Communion, but all civil Conversation with them; and commanded his people not to let any of them come within their doors. But this was only at *Rome*. For it does not appear that he pretended any Authority elsewhere. And

M

how

*Euseb. Hist.
Eccles. V. 24.
Valer. in locum.*

*Firmilian's E-
pistle among
Cyprian's, Epist.
75. pag. 166.
edit. Rigaltii.*

Cyp. Epist. 74.
 & 75.
Vide Rigalt. in
Cyprian, Epist.
 75.

how he was scorn'd abroad for his Pride and Folly in this, the Reader may see in those two excellent Epistles. The later of which was left out of the Roman Edition of St. *Cyprian*: and *Pamelius* honestly declares he would have stifled it, if others had not publish'd it before him.

July 28. and
August 2.

Lest any one should take offence at my not giving the usual garnish of the Popes of that Age to those two whom I mentioned, (for I dare not call them Saints and Martyrs, though the Roman Church does, both elsewhere, and in her Offices on their days) I ought to let him know how that Church is abused by them that have gained no small advantage to themselves by such Fictions. That the old Roman Church in the time of *Constantius* knew nothing of either of their Martyrdoms, it appears by her Catalogue of Popes, publisht first by *Cuspinian*, and since by *Bucherius* the Jesuite. Nay she knew the contrary of one of them. For in the Roman Calendar of that Age, publisht by the same Jesuite, *Victor* is not mentioned at all, and *Stephen* is among the Popes that were no Martyrs. If this proof were not enough, or if this place were proper for it, I should shew from good Authors, that though these Popes lived under Emperors that were afterwards Persecutors; yet they died before the beginning of their persecutions. I do not say but they may be Saints; but if they are, 'tis more than we have any ground to believe. For neither the Church-History, nor any Writer within a hundred years of their time, has any more of their Sanctity than of their Sufferings. Of *Stephen* there is great cause to doubt the contrary from

from what we read of him in St. *Cyprian's* * Epistle, * *Cyprian*, Ep. 74. & 75. and more from that of *Firmilian*, † which is † *Rigalt. Obs.* thought to have been translated by St. *Cyprian*, in Ep. 75. and which was written * about the time of *Stephen's* death, rather after than before it. * Almost 22 years after the

It is to be hoped that many Roman Catholics among us have truly that Reverence which all of them profess to true Primitive Christian Antiquity, and to the judgment of Saints and Martyrs in all Ages. We all agree that *Irenæus* and *Cyprian* had a just right to those Titles. And *Firmilian* was a chief Pillar of the Church in his Age. He was thought worthy to preside in several Eastern Councils: namely, in that against the *Novatians*, before *Stephen* was Pope: and those against *Samosatenus*, after *Stephen* was dead. And after his own death, the Eastern * Church of that Age called him *Firmilian of Blessed Memory*. Why this man is not in the Calendar of Saints, they best know who can tell us why *Victor* and *Stephen* are there. No doubt the Saint-makers do all things with great consideration. But can any one imagine that those excellent men did ever believe themselves to be under the Roman Bishop? that they ow'd any obedience to Him whom they school'd so, or any Reverence to his Censures which they slighted in that manner? Could any assurance of their Cause have justified that contempt of Authority, if they had known any in him? But it appears they knew it not; nor did others in that Age. Those that were against them in the Cause, blamed them for that, and nothing

Reign of *Alexander Severus*.
Cyprian, Epist. 75. P. 160.

* In their Sy-
nodical Epist.

else; and yet held Communion with them, for all Pope *Stephen* and his Censures.

So far it appears those great men had the judgment of the Church on their side. They knew of no Authority over the Universal Church that the Pope had more than any other Bishop by any right, whether Divine or Humane. What the Judgment of the Church was in the next Centuries, let them consider that shall read those Canons * in the Margent, and remember they are such as past in the first Four General Councils, and in the African Council of 217 Bishops, (of whom *St. Austin* was one) assembled at *Carthage*. To which I add, the African Church to Pope *Celestine* I. as containing a full Declaration of their mind in that Canon. I know there are objections against one or two of these Canons. But all the dust that has been rais'd will not hinder any reasonable man from seeing that which, I think, is sufficient for our purpose: namely, that all the Fathers that sate in those Councils, or at least the major part of them, were of the same judgment with those above-mentioned in this point of the Authority of the Bishop of *Rome*. They all allow'd him precedency as being Bishop of the Imperial City. They had commonly a great deference to his judgment in Debates between themselves. And sometimes the Christian Emperors made him honorary Judge, whether alone or with others, in such Controversies.

* See in the *Coдекс*, *Canonum Universalis Ecclesie*, or in the Councils;
Concil. Nicen. I. can. 6.
Concil. Constant. I. can. 2.
Concil. Ephes. I. can. 8.
Conc. Chalced. can. 28. together with *Act.* 16. of that Council.
Concil. Afric. can. 31. in the Greek, or 72. and 92. in the Latin.
Epist. ad Celestinum, which is at the end of that Council.

† The Western and Eastern Bishops together, were 170. saith *St. Athanasius*, (who was one of them) *Ad Solit. vitam agendam*, Tom. 1. 812. Of the Eastern, 73 declared against the Western Bishops. *Hilar. Frág.* p. 448. and some were Neuters.

Easter-

Easterlings had left them, were *pleased* meerly of *their Charity* to give him a new Power, to order the reviewing of any Provincial Judgment upon complaint of any Bishop that was aggrieved in it. And Pope *Leo* not being satisfied with this, got the Emperor *Valentinian III.* to ordain * that the Bishop of *Rome* should give Law throughout his part of the Empire (which then contained little more than *Italy*, and part of *France*, and part of *Spain*, and the *Illyrian* Diocefs.) Yet all that the Bishop of *Rome* had by these Concessions and Grants did not amount to an Authority over the Universal Church. I add, nor over the *British* Church in

* particular. And so far was this from arguing that he had by *Divine Right* any Jurisdiction out of his own Diocefs, that his seeking or accepting what was given him by these Concessions or Grants, is a convincing argument to the contrary. But for the Churches Judgment, nothing can be more plain, than that all those Bishops who gave their Votes to those Canons which I cited before out of the first Four General Councils, and that of *Africk*, together with the Epistle annext, had no question or thought of any Authority that he had by *Divine Right* out of his own proper Diocefs, or by *Humane Right* out of the Roman Patriarchy, or any power of Jurisdiction that he had elsewhere from the Roman Emperors, or from the Primitive Fathers.

* By his No-
vel, dated *445*.
June 6.
Vid. *Leo I*.
Epist. 89.

* There were
no British Bi-
shops at the
Council of
Sardica; as
appears by the
Inscription of
the Synodical
Epistle, *Athanas.*
Tom 1. p. 756.
and by the
Subscriptions,
both of the
Synodical
Epistle, *Hilar.*
Fragm. col. 408.
and of the Ca-
nons in the
Edition of
Isidorus Mox-
icator.
Though the
British Bi-
shops or some
of them did

afterwards approve of the Councils Judgment in the case of *St. Athanasius*. *Ath. Tom. 1. p. 720*. (where note, the Translation is false.) And as for that Law of *Valentinian III.* It was not made till after *Britain* was forsaken by the *Romans*; which was *Theodosius 18* (or *Anno 440*.) saith *Prosper Pitheas*; *Anno 443*. saith the *Saxons Chron. Theodosius 23*. (or *Anno 455*.) saith *Bede*, *Hist. l. 13*.

* Page 4, 5,
 &c.

Whatsoever power he has gotten since the decay of the Roman Empire and of the Christian Religion, (from whence I have already * dated the beginning of Popery) as it is plain he has gotten in many Countries, which were not anciently within his Jurisdiction upon any account, it must be either by force or fraud, abusing either the weakness or ignorance of the people, or else by the concession or connivence of Princes and States. Blessed be God, there are some Christian Nations in the world which have stood so far out of his reach, that he has not been able to hook them in by any of these ways. And as he has no colourable pretence to a power over those Countries where it is certain he never had any, as *Ethiopia, Russia, &c.* (which they that are pleased to call therefore Schismatical, must give me leave to admire as well their folly as their uncharitableness: and yet they that do not call them so, make the Pope no Head of the Universal Church:) so in those Countries where he has gotten power, it is not necessary that he should always hold it, till we see who is *Antichrist*, whether He, or one of the Tribe of *Dan*, who (they say) shall come to take it from him. They over whom he gain'd a power by force or fraud, are kept under it still the same way; which creates no right by any Law whatsoever. And therefore when God makes them strong enough, and wise enough, they will deliver themselves from him. They that gave him a power over them when they saw cause, may have as good or better cause to recal it. And they have just cause to do this, when they see him desert that Title by their Gift, and
 claim

claim his power by *immediate Divine Right*, or when he employs his power *not to edification but destruction*: and specially when doing all this he 2 Cor. 10. 8. will force their obedience by such means, as come not from the *Wisdom which is from above*, but from James 3. 15. that which the Apostle calls *earthly, sensual, devilish*.

Whosoever among our Roman Catholicks will be pleased to consider these things with that Attention and Impartiality that is due to all things of Religion, I cannot but think he will see that the Christian Religion doth no way oblige him to own the Popes Authority in this Kingdom.

He will see that *Jure Divino* the Pope could have no Authority over this particular Church, which he had not over the Church universal. And it doth not appear by any Records of the Primitive times, that the Pope ever had any such Authority over the Universal Church, or that by the Diffusive Church he was believed or acknowledged to have it.

But on the contrary it appears, by instances which I have given of those times, that he was denied to have such an Authority, and that as well by the Bishops assembled in their Councils, as by the best and wisest men of those times in their Writings: Nay he was contradicted and resisted as oft as he endeavoured to impose any thing against the mind of particular Churches.

He will see that whatsoever Humane Right the Pope had acquired over the people of this Kingdom, was no more of one kind, than we are all originally of one Nation; and that the power
which

From King
Stephen to Hen.
III.

which he was suffered to exercise over us, was very much greater at one time than another. In the worst and darkeſt times it was higheſt, for it grew up on the bad Titles or other weakneſs of Princes; and yet then he could not hold it peaceably, nor long enough to make a Preſcription. But at all other times it was much leſs than he claim'd; which ſheweth plainly it was no more but what the State pleaſed to give him: and they owned that the Pope had no right over them by any conſeſſions of their own, more than what he had over the reſt of the Weſtern Churches.

Particularly, in thoſe times next before the Reformation, that right which was generally acknowledged to be in him, was not a ſupreme right, but ſubordinate to a General Council.

Piſa, Conſtance,
Sienſ, and Ba-
ſil.

Greg. XII. and
Bennet XIII.
and John
XXIII.

This appears to have been the ſenſe of the Weſtern Church. For it was declared in plain terms by four Councils, which were acknowledged for General in that Age, and were abetted as ſuch by the generality of the Weſtern Church. They not only declared this Doctrin in their Canons, but they reduced it to practice. For thoſe Councils depoſed divers Popes, and made new ones in their ſtead. Which Acts of theirs the Papalins of this Age are obliged to defend, as ill as they like the Canons; for without them they cannot make up the ſucceſſion of their preſent Popes. But admitting thoſe Acts to have been juſt and good, how can they reject thoſe Canons from which they had their virtue and efficacy? If they ſay the Pope did not approve them, it is partly true. Out of doubt thoſe Popes did not like them that loſt by them.

Nor

Nor perhaps those that came in by those Canons might not like them so well at another time. But how then could they take upon them to be Popes? Their accepting a Title from those Councils, and the Peoples owning them in it, was enough to shew that those Canons were then in force; and they were never repealed by any Council since; nor hath there been any Council to do it, that can be reasonably thought so fit, as those four were, to declare the sense of the Western diffusive Church.

Therefore taking it for proved, that a general Council is superiour to the Pope, it must necessarily follow that there lies an Appeal from the Pope to such a Council. And that his hands are tied up by such an Appeal; so that he cannot proceed at least to Censure the Appellant; for this were not only a private Injury to the Person, but an Invasion of the Rights of the Supreme Court of Judicature among Christians. Therefore if the Pope should do so Uncanonical a thing, he may be Canonically disobeyed and resisted. Yea, he ought to be so (for it were a betraying the Churches right to do otherwise) till there is such a Court or Council to which the Appeal was made. And such a Council there would be at least once in ten years, if the Pope did not hinder it. For having taken upon himself the power of Calling and Presiding in Councils, it is his pleasure to have none. And no doubt he hath reason for it, though there is Law to the contrary, as good Law for a Council every ten* years as can * Council. Can. 8. Self. 39. be made by any Authority in the Western Church.

N

Such

Such Appeals from the Pope to a General Council have been made by divers Persons and Societies in the Roman Communion ; as namely, by *Auxilius* in the name of the Clergy of all *Italy*; By *Michael of Casena* in the name of the whole *Franciscan Order*; By seven Cardinals, who were at that time the major part of their Colledge; By divers Emperours of *Germany*, against divers Popes, some of whom they deposed, and made other Popes in their Councils; By divers Kings of *France*, some of whom have forbid all Communication with *Rome* till they had right done them in their Controversies.

That some of these had cause enough for what they did, and that they had just Authority to do it, will be granted by most of them of the Roman Church. But they will not grant the like of our King *Henry VIII.* whom they make Author of the Protestant Schism, as they call it. And yet setting aside Popular Opinions and Prejudices, I do not see what there was really in his Case which might not be cleared from Schism by those Rules and Examples. I speak only of his casting off the Popes Authority, as being that which no doubt was a means to bring on the Reformation. As for those other things with which he is charged, they are extrinsick to our Cause, and we are no way accountable for them. Namely, for his dissolving of Monasteries, It was (a) one whom *Wolsey* had bred to it that taught him the way, and (b) they whom he employed would have burnt us if we had lived in those days. For his being *Head of the Church*, whosoever is offended at it, let him blame

Aux. Part I.
28 and ult. and
II, 14, 21.

Theod. de Niem.
Nimorin, part. 6.
c. 10.

Joh. Marini
de Schism. &
Cont. 1. 19, &
24.

a *Tho. Cromwel.*
Herbert. p. 173,
174.
b *Dr. Lay* and
Vigonion. Fox.
p. 119.
Gr. London. Fox
p. 897, and
1104, &c.

blame the (c) Six-Article men who brought up that Title, and who both Preached and Writ for it, and not the Q. Elizabeth Protestants (d) who cast it forth. Much more for his Personal excels, whatsoever they were, if they concern any Religion, it must be theirs and not ours. For *as to his Conscience*, (e) they tell us, *he always continued a Roman Catholic.*

^c H. Gardi *rev.*
B. Banner, &c.

^d Camden, *Eliz.*
P 25.

^e Sand. *de*
Schism. p. 103.
B. Ed. 1585.
Crossy Pref. 20
Exam. -

These things being set apart, or charged where they ought to be, there will remain on our account only this to be considered, Whether that Prince were guilty of Schism in casting the Popes Authority out of this Kingdom? Or whether he did no more in that matter than he might lawfully do, according to the Principles of his own, that is, the Roman, Communion? If he had Right to Appeal from the Pope to a Council, and was hindered by him from prosecuting that right, and was thereby forced to disobey and oppose him; in this Case it has been shewn that Disobedience and Resistance was Lawful. Whether that were his Case, will appear by searching into matter of Fact. And to be rightly informed of this, one must not take all for true that Sanders says; though having the luck to be contemned at the first by them that should have confuted him, he has carried the World before him ever since, being not only transcribed by the Writers of his side, but also followed by many others that seem not to know whence they have their Stories. We that live in a more inquisitive Age have seen *many things* of which he is the Author, acknowledged by his (a) Friends to be *very improbable*, and some things proved by (b) others to have been altogether

^a Labbe Chroa.
An. 1528.
^b L. Herbert
in Henry VIII.

impossible. Yet in those things which he says without evident partiality, Protestants are not unwilling he should be heard; and Roman Catholics may be content to hear others with him, who, though Protestants, yet, are not liable to the like imputation.

- In the Cause of that King's Appeal, many things are to be considered elsewhere, which are not proper for this occasion. It suffices to know that in his Minority he was (c) betrothed to *Katharine of Spain* his Brothers Widow. That the Contract was made by his Father, for reasons of State, against the judgment and advice of (d) *Archbishop Warham*; who then told him that he thought it *neither honourable, nor well-pleasing to God*. That the (e) People at that time murmured against it, and (f) soon after the Prince himself, as *Warham* advised, made a formal Protestation that he would never marry her. And yet, after his Fathers death, he was perswaded to it, and did (g) marry her with the Popes Dispensation. When he had lived with her near seventeen years, and, as (h) *Sanders* says, was weary of her, (whether he was or no is not material,) the Popes Legate Cardinal *Wolsey* * pretended to have found a Nullity in the Marriage; and, in care for the King's Salvation, (as he said) acquainted Bishop *Longland*, the Kings Confessor, with it. They both declared this to the King; whose ancient doubt being now revived, he spent (i) *almost a whole year* in Study and Consultation concerning it.
- * 1502 ending.
- * *L. Herbert. Ib.*
- * *Ibid.*
- † 1504. *June*
27. *Ibid.* page 249.
- § 1508. *June 3. Pol. Virgil.*
- h *Sand. de Sch.* page 9. who makes 1526. the First Year of the Divorce.
- * *Sand. Ib. & Pallavicino.*
- i *Hist. Conc. Trent II. 15. 5. Sand. Ib. p. 10.*

I enter not into the merit of the Cause, being indifferent at this time whether the Marriage was Lawful or no. For it appears (which is enough) that he had reason to doubt, and that he took the best way for satisfaction, according to their Principles.

When * he had satisfied his own Judgment, (as ^{* 1527. the} (i) himself says, though † *Sanders* say otherwise.) ^{Second Year.}
 And had the Judgments, not only of those Men ^{† L. Herbert.}
 before-mentioned, but of all the (k) Clergy of ^{† Sand. Ibid.}
England, save two, that his Marriage was Null; ^{* 1527. Septem.}
 And he had (l) reason to believe that most Lear- ^{L. Herbert.}
 ned Men abroad were of the same Opinion; there
 wanted only this more to have the Popes De-
 claration of the Nullity. This at present could
 not be had, for he was the Emperour's prisoner.
 But as soon as he was at liberty, being desired by
 the King, who had (m) obliged him above all
 men, and whom as yet he had occasion to use, it
 seemed at first that there would be no difficulty
 that way. For the Pope granted all his requests,
 gave the King what (n) Commissioners he had
 named, empower'd them to hear the matter in
England, gave them (o) Bulls to shew the King;
 and to assure him he was in earnest, because things
 could not be done presently in form of Law, he
 gave him secret (p) advice to marry while the
 cause was depending.

The King having been two years without
 a Wife, and not only holding himself free in
 his conscience, but expecting to be shortly de-
 clared so, and having now some kind of leave
 to chuse another; cast his eye on *Anne*

(q) *Bokn*,

† From the Bi-
 shop of *Tarbes*'s
 Speech before
 the Council.
Sand. de Schism.
 page 10.

in *Pallava Hist.*
Conc. Trid. II.
 15. 9.

* *Sand. de*
Schism. p. 27.
 L. *Herb.* p. 233.
 * *Gauechard.*
Hist. Ital. l. 19.
Cand. Elie. p. 3.

* 1528. Jan. 13.
 Letter of
Casala in L.
Herbert.
 1528. The
 Third Year.

¹ Camden *Eliz.* p. 2. saith in his 32. year of age. But he was born 1491. *June 28.*

² Camden. *Ibid.* p. 102.

³ Camden. *Ibid.* saith, being then returned. *Haylin* saith, she returned with her Father from his Embassie; which was in 1527. saith *Stow*, in that year.

⁴ Page 10.

⁵ Camden. *Ibid.*

Saed. de Schöfn. p. 23.

Pallavic. Ibid. 11. 15. 9.

⁶ Saed. *Ibid.*
P. 17.

⁷ *Camd. Eliz.*
P. 3.

⁸ *L. Herb.*

P. 232.

⁹ *Saed.* *Ibid.*

p. 28.

¹⁰ *L. Herb.* 1528.
Decemb. 17.

¹¹ Signified to the King, 1529
Jan. 13. *L. Herbert.* publisht
July 3. *Ibid.*
¹² *Touss.* l. 1.
p. 18. C. D.

¹³ Avocation
signed *Jan. 15.*
L. Herbert.

(q) *Bolen*, one whose Person and Birth might have (r) deserved the best of his subjects; and who being then a stranger in (1) *England*, could not have that part which * *Sanders* gives her in displacing Queen *Katharine*; nor could have preserved her any otherwise, than by submitting to the King's lust, the refusal (t) whereof made her worthy of a nobler application. But this Lady had been brought up in *France*

among Protestants, and was suspected to have some inclination (u) that way; which suspicion was enough, not only to blacken her, but to dash the King's (x) suit, much the sooner if not only for her sake. It moved but slowly before, for the Pope, being (y) engaged by the Emperour, had sent instructions (z) after his Legates, requiring them to use all possible delays, either to conceal (a) his Bulls, or to burn them, and leave him free to do as he should see occasion. Thus far he seems to have gone, before he heard what choice the King had made. But when that was discovered, (and whether for that cause, or because he had made a new (b) Alliance with the Emperour, which tended to make the Popes (c) Nephew Duke of *Florence*, and the Queen being the Emperour's Aunt ought in reason to have some benefit of it) whatsoever moved him to it, the Pope after this would trust her cause no longer in *England*, but having voided (d) that Commission to his Legates, called it home to his own Determination.

The

The King not knowing what to do next, and taking time to consider in his Progress, had (e) *Cranmer* brought to him by some that chanced to hear him say what they thought was material in the Case. He was a (f) stranger to all that had passed hitherto (which I mention, because some would make him a chief man in it.) But from what he had heard, and especially from their discourse, he judged that the King had taken a wrong way; in courting the Pope to retract his Predecessour's dispensation: whereas in truth, as most learned men thought, the Matter it self was Indispensable. And because it was not reasonable to expect that the Pope would judge it so, (for that had been to cut off a main limb of the Papacy) he therefore wish'd that instead of dancing attendance at *Rome*, the King would send to the Universities (as being most able and unconcerned) and get them to declare their Judgments in the case. Hereupon the King sent (g) learned men with his case, and got the judgments of the Universities upon it. To send to those in the Emperours dominions had been to no purpose. But he had ours in *England*, and those in *France* of his side; and the two (b) chief in *Italy*, though not only the Emperour (i) opposed, but the Pope, (k) who had *Bologna* in his Territory. And whereas it is said the King bought them, which his Agents (l) deny; they say that the Emperour bought (m) hands on the contrary; and that he offered largely to get those who had given their judgments for the King to retract it, but they would not take his Money, though they might much more safely than

the

1529. the fourth year.

^e In *August.*

^f Fox Mart.

p. 1688. lin. 22.

^g Fuller Hist.

of Camb. Sect.

6. n. 40.

^s Cardinal Bel-

lay's brother,

and Bishop

Stokefly.

Stow, p. 532.

1530. the fifth

year.

^b *Bologna* and

Padua.

ⁱ *L. Herb.* 1530.

Jur. 13. and 22.

^k *L. Herb.* lb.

Aug. 24. and 29.

and *Sept.* 23.

^l *Aug.* 31. *Ibid.*

^m *Sped.* *Hier.* 2.

n. 71.

the other. The King being thus strengthened in his cause, had reason to be the less in fear of the Pope, and yet it appears he was not the more willing to break with him. For, after this, he made fresh (a) application to him by his Orators and Letters; which were seconded with a Petition under the hands and seals of both the (b) Archbishops and others, the chief men of the three States of this Kingdom. They represented their own and others judgments of the case, they passionately besought him to do the King and them right in it, they declared that if he did not, they should think he had left them to themselves. All this came out of time, for the Pope was not then to be persuaded to break his Alliance while he was gathering (c) the fruits of it. This the King understood by his (d) Answer. And therefore knowing what he was to expect from abroad, he was the more careful to secure himself at home. Where to satisfy the minds of the people, he declared what had passed to all his Subjects in (e) Parliament; he shewed them the Judgments of the Universities, and the books of above one hundred Doctors against the lawfulness of his Marriage. He also caused the same to be shewn (f) to Queen Katharine by some Lords of his Council; who would have persuaded her to withdraw her Appeal that she had made to the Pope, and to refer her cause to the Judgment of others. She refused it, and thereupon (g) was removed from the Court, and had her choice given her of the Kings houses in the Country.

The

^a *Card. Eli.*
P. 3. and 4.

^b *Walshy and*
Watham. L. Hist.
P. 334.

^c 1530. Aug 9.
Florence taken,
1531. July 7.
Alex. Medicis
made Duke of
it. *Ricciol.*
Chron.

^d *L. Hist.* p.
335.
1531. The
Sixth Year.
^e Apr. 30.
Stew.

L. Hist. p.
352.
May 31.
^f *L. Hist.* p.
354.

^g July 14.
L. Hist. Ibid.

The Queen prosecuting her Appeal, the Pope by Letters exhorted the King to receive her. Which he refused, as being unlawful for him to do; and offered the (b) Pope to send Doctors to dispute it before him. He also got (i) the King of France, to mediate for him, who did it, as being assured of the Justice of his Cause. But all this did not hinder the Pope from (k) committing it to the Dean of the *Rota*, who cited the King to appear before him. This being done (k) once, and (l) again, the King entered his (m) Protest against all proceedings in that Court. And the same (n) day he privately married *Anne Bolen*; in which, if he was too hasty, it was because he had not been quite seven years to consider. Not long after this, he had (o) the Nullity of his former Marriage judg'd and declared in his own Kingdom. which being done, he owned her publicly as his Queen, and gave her the (p) solemnity of a Coronation. This was no sooner heard of at *Rome*, but the Pope, (who as long as the King was Plaintiff, had used (q) all possible delay and dissimulation; now the Scales being turned,) without delay (r) declared this Marriage a Nullity; and gave Sentence of Excommunication against the King, unless he put away *Anne*, and restored *Katharine*, before the end of September next. The mean while the Pope made sure of the French King by a Treaty then afoot, which produced an Interview between them at *Marseilles*, and a Marriage between their two nearest Relations. Our King, in hope this new Alliance would have given good effect to the French King's Mediation in his

O

behalf,

¹ 1532. Feb.

¹ L. Herb. p. 363.

¹ March 16.

¹ L. Herb. p. 364.

¹ 1532. the five-

¹ venth year.

¹ July 8.

¹ L. Herb. p. 364.

¹ Nov. 4.

¹ Nov. 14.

¹ L. Herb. Ibid.

¹ Sand. de

¹ Schism. p. 60.

¹ Cooper. Hist.

¹ Ibid. 129, &c.

¹ 1533. the

¹ eighth year.

¹ May 23.

¹ L. Herb. p. 375.

¹ &c.

¹ Jan. 1.

¹ Sand. de

¹ Schism. p. 29.

¹ July 11.

¹ L. Herb. p. 386.

behalf, sent his Embassadors thither. They waited there for a while, but found nothing but delays. And the Pope was now returning to *Rome*, where he resolved to proceed in the Cause. Therefore at an (f) Audience before him, they declared the King's Appeal from the Pope to the next lawful General Council. Which Appeal the Pope (t) rejected, as being unlawful, and against the constitution of one of his Predecessours. He also declared that there should be a General Council; but that the calling of it belonged not to the King, but to himself. And soon after, the term that he had set for the restoring of Queen *Katharine* being now expired, he caused his Sentence against the King to be openly set up at *Dunkirk*, which was then in the Emperours Dominions.

This was only a declarative Sentence, in the case of *Attentates*, as they term it; but this being passed, there was no doubt but soon after he would proceed to a Definitive Sentence in the cause.

The King was now concerned to look about him, and to provide for the worst that could happen. Therefore first, with the advice of his (u) Council, he acquainted his Subjects with his Appeal, which he caused to be set up on every Church door throughout his Kingdom; And that his people might understand the validity of it, he commanded that they should be taught, that a General Council is above the Pope, and that by Gods Law the Pope has no more to do in *England* than any other Foreign Bishop. Next he sent to engage as many Foreign Princes as he could into a stricter Alliance with him. And yet lastly, to
shew

t Nov. 7.
Banner delivered the
Appeal.

L. Herb. p. 389.

t Nov. 10.

L. Herb. Ibid.

u Decemb 2.

L. Herb. p. 395.

396.

shew that he sought not these ways, but was driven to them; he (x) desired the Bishop of *Paris*, * *L.Herb.*
 who was then Embassadour in *England*, to get his p.395. and *Labb.*
 Prince to deal effectually with the Pope; and Chron.A.1534
 promise in his name, that if the Pope would forbear to pass any definitive Sentence, till the cause might be heard before indifferent Judges, he would also forbear what he had otherwise purposed to do, that is, to withdraw his obedience from the See of *Rome*. The Bishop gladly took the office of Mediation upon himself; and though it was now † the dead of Winter, yet he went post
 to *Rome* to discharge it. There in Consistory he delivered his Message to the Pope; and so far prevailed, that, at his earnest request, there was a present stop of proceedings, on condition, that the King should send a Ratification of his promise precisely by such a day. In prefixing the day they seemed not to have considered the time of the year. For though the Messenger, whom the Bishop sent into *England*, found a present dispatch there; yet, being hindered (y) by weather, he did not return within his day. The Pope, as if he had watcht for that advantage, resolved immediately to proceed to a definitive Sentence. There being
 (z) a Consistory called for that purpose, the Bishop once more came in, and pressed for a longer time. He begg'd no more but *six days*, which as he said (a) might be granted to a King that had waited on them with patience for six years. It was put to the vote; where, through the eagerness of the Imperial Cardinals, not only that small request was denied; but such (b) precipitation was used,

† In the *Christ-*
mas holy-days.
L.Herb. p.396.

y *L.Herb.* and
Labb. *Ibid.*

* 534.
 ‡ March 19.
L.Herb. p.396.

L.Herb. *Ibid.*

* *L.Herb.* and
Labb. *Ibid.*

that as much was done at once in that Consistory, as would have askt no less than thrice according to their usual forms. Such haste they were in, to cut off, and to destroy him whom three Popes (c) successively had entitled their Defender and Deliverer. When they had done their will; within less than six days, that is, the second day after this rash and hasty Sentence, the Post (d) returned from the King with a Ratification of all

that had been promised in his name. And he brought this further offer from the King, that he would submit to the Judgment of that Court, on condition that the Imperial Cardinals, who had made themselves Parties against him, should be none of his Judges. There was an Authority sent, for Proctors to appear for him on that condition. At which great submission of the King, compared with their precipitation, the wiser Cardinals (e) were astonished, and petitioned the Pope for an arrest of Judgment. Which could not well be denied him in those Circumstances. And yet it was as if it had not been granted; for they that got the Sentence passed by majority of Votes, had the same will and power to get it confirmed. And (f) confirmed it was, with this advantage; that the Execution of the Sentence was committed to the Emperour; who would be sure to see it done thoroughly, as well to enrich himself with the Spoils, as to take his revenge in the ruine of a Prince that had provoked him no way more, than in his zeal for the deliverance of this Pope out of his hands.

In

* Pope Julius II. styled him,
Defender of the Papal Dignity.
Leo X. styled him, Defender
of the Faith.

And Clement VII. The Deli-
verer of the Roman City.

† L. Herb. and Labb. Ibid.

* L. Herb.
p. 397.

† Mar. 22.
L. Herb. Ibid.

In this series of things, I cannot but observe the hand of God; and adore that unsearchable wisdom by which he made way to bring in the Reformation of this Church. There was no King in that Age so zealous for Popery, as he had been, that came now to throw it out of his Kingdom. Whosoever considers him from first to last in this business, cannot but see he had no intention to do this. He did all things to avoid it, that could be done by one who was persuaded of the Justice of his cause. And those Princes and Prelates who were persuaded as he was, did their parts to hinder things from coming to this extremity. None desired it but the Spanish and Imperial Faction, unless perhaps the Pope himself could desire to lessen the Papacy, by cutting off a whole Kingdom from the Church, but he (*g*) seemed to mind nothing but the raising of his Family, and in order to that, let the Imperialists do what they would with him. Perhaps he might think, when his own turns were served, to give the King satisfaction afterwards; as it may seem by what (*h*) one says, that when the Sentence was past, he suspended the Execution of it till the end of *September* next. But he died (*i*) before that time, and so his Sentence continued in force.

The next Pope that came after him did not approve what he had done; for to use his own (*k*) words he had urged him to *right the King in his Divorce*, and would have persuaded the Emperour to have borne it patiently. But as then he could not prevail on that side, so now he came too late to be heard on the other. For on the (*l*) day of

L. Herbert.
p. 406.

Baronius ann.
1534. 7.

1534. Sept. 26.

Paul III.

L. Herbert. p. 453.

Novem. 3.

of his Coronation at *Rome* the Parliament met here in *England* that made the Act of Supremacy. The edge of which Law falling severely on the Friends of the Papacy, even while (*m*) the Pope was offering at a reconciliation; he was thereby provoked to (*n*) curse the King afresh, by a Bull which yet was not published till some years after. When the King having presumed to Un-saint *Thomas Becket*, the Pope (*o*) thereupon pronounced him no King, which made the breach quite unreconcilable.

^m L.Hrb. Ibid.

ⁿ 1535
Aug. 30. L.Hrb.
P 394.

^o 1538.
Dec. 17. L.Hrb.
and Libb.

I have given so large account of this matter, because it is brought into common discourse; and as it is told, serves to blacken many other, beside the King who was only or chiefly concerned in it. Otherwise it would serve for our present occasion, to shew, (which I think I have sufficiently done,) that he had cause to Appeal from the Pope to a Council, that he did Appeal in due form of Law, and prosecuted it with great Moderation; which was enough to acquit him from Schism, as far as we are concerned in it: That on the other hand the Pope rejected his Appeal, to the affront of that Supreme Tribunal among Christians; and not only proceeded against the Appellant, in which case the Appellant might, and ought, to resist him; but he also took a course that the case should never be otherwise. For whereas the Pope assumes to himself the only power to call Councils, and whereas there had been none in Ten years, to say no more, and therefore a Council ought to have been then according to the Canons; yet the Pope would have no Council, then, nor afterwards, till he

he had tried all other ways to destroy both the L. Herb. p. 489.
King and his Kingdom.

When at last, after many years talk and deliberation, a Council was called, that at *Trent*, which pretends to be a General Council; it was such as the King could not think himself bound to acknowledge, nay he was bound to oppose it, as well for his own preservation, as to maintain the Common Right of Christians, according to the Principles then received in the Western Church.

By his Appeal, he was not bound to submit to any other than he expressed in it, that is, a Lawful General Council. Such the Councils of *Constance* and *Basil* were then generally acknowledged to have been. And it was the cry of the Western Church, as well in this as the foregoing Ages, for such a Council, as those were, *to reform abuses as well in the Head as in the Members.* But the Head was as it would be; and therefore, being to chuse, would take no Physick to cure it self. This was visible in the Popes extreme averfeness to a Council; till he saw that, without it, the Nations were likely to Reform themselves. Then he began to think it needful to call one himself. But at first he named no time or place. Then he named first one Town, and then another. When men began to think he was in earnest, (for they had been often fooled with reports,) the King declared he would not own a Council called by the Popes single Authority. It was the Judgment of the Church of *England* that he ought not to own it; for so their Synod declared, *that neither the Bishop of Rome, nor any one Prince whatsoever, may by his own*
Marius de Schism. & Conc. part 3. c. 15.
Pallav. hist. IH. 12. 5.
Stow Chron. 1533. May.
Mantua, Vicenza.
1536. July 20.
L. Herb. p. 472.
472.
Authority

Authority call a General Council without the expresse consent of the residue of Christian Princes. When afterwards it appeared that the Pope was intent upon it, the King, on the same grounds, made his publick Protestation; shewing that *the Indiction of a Council belonged not to the Bishop of Rome, but to the Emperour and Princes which should send or come thither.* The like Protestation he sent abroad into all forein Countries. And he afterward made it good, by not sending one Bishop to the Council when it met; though one of his Subjects was there, whom the Pope was pleased to make a Bishop with a Title in this Kingdom.

1557. Mar. 25.
L. Herb. p. 489.

1538. April 8.
L. Herb. p. 502.

Rich. Patiss
Titular Bishop
of Worcester,
L. Herb. p. 609.

Having thus no obligation to own this for a General Council; he was therefore obliged to oppose it, as being the Mockery and Abuse of that Supreme Judicatory, joyned with the defrauding all Christians of their right in it, and particularly himself of the benefit of his Appeal to it. Which things he ought to have considered, had it been held in the most innocent manner. But much more being held as it was, with most apparent design, to establish those abuses which all *Christendome* cried out to have reformed, to deprive the diffusive Church of that which was the only remedy for them, to bring it to pass that there should be no more General Council, as now we see there is like to be none while the world stands; particularly as to himself he had cause to oppose *the Trent Council*, as far as he was able. For it was originally *designed to please the Emperour; and thereby to oblige him to head the Party of Christian Princes, whom the Pope was then uniting

* L. Herbent.
P. 451, 452.

uniting to make War against *England*. And as that Council was framed in all its circumstances, the King could consider it no otherwise than he did the Pope himself, who was his open and implacable Enemy: For as the Pope called it by his single Authority, so he always presided in it by his Legates. He had it filled with his Creatures, Italians, and others, who were sure to carry every thing by their Number. And yet for fear they should forget themselves, every thing must be examined at *Rome*, before it could pass through their hands. And being past, yet it was of no force till it had the Pope's Approbation. By which means he made himself so far Lord of this Council, that though perhaps he could not pass whatsoever he pleased, yet nothing could pass that should displease him in it. And least, by taking all this care, the Pope might seem to intend no more but only to secure himself, without doing the King a farther injury; there was one thing which made it appear that he had as great a mind to plague the King as to provide for his own preservation. For among all his number of Cardinals he could find none fitter to preside in the Council; and there to judge the King's cause, (if he were so unwise as to send it thither) than one that was the King's Enemy more than the Pope himself, if it were possible. That was (a) Cardinal *Pool*, the King's unnatural Subject and Kinsman; who being (b) brought up by him, and sent to travel for his farther improvement, and, while he was abroad, being (c) intrusted by him in his cause, forsook it, and joined himself

P

^a L. Her. p. 584, and 591.
^b B. Tunstall's Letter in *Forrest's Acts*, &c. II. 347. 60. Edit. 1641.
^c Sand. de *Schism.* p. 53. to L. Her. p. 319.

to the Imperial party. In which, though he might pretend that he followed his Conscience, yet nothing could excuse him for practising against his King and his Country. He was the man employed to (d) write against the King's Divorce; and out-did other Writers in this, that he (e) stirred up the Emperour to revenge his Aunts injury, for fear he should forget it; and not only so, but (f) *went about from Prince to Prince, and from Country to Country to stir them up to War against this Realm.* For which so unworthy and so officious a disloyalty, he was (g) declared Traitor at home by Act of Parliament, and (h) had a price set upon his Head; not to mention other instances of the King's extreme displeasure against him. When this had so far endeared him to the Pope, that being not content to have made him one of his Cardinals, he must also have this man to preside in his Council; the *English* had so much the more cause to be jealous, and to stand upon their guard, as well against his Council as himself.

A General Council they could not hold it to be, for their Church was not allowed to have any Right in it. Though she had not lost her Right, any otherwise, than as being cut off by the Pope's uncanonical Censures; against which she was relievable on her Appeal thither, if that had truly been a General Council. And the Bishops whom she should send to represent her in such a Council had as much to do there (precedence only

^d Sand. de
Schis. p. 55.

^e L. Herbert.
p. 415. v. Poli
Orat. ad Imp.

^f E. Tassal. lib.
II. 345. 10. in
his printed
Sermon. Ibid.
341. 46.

^g L. Herbert.

p. 511.

^h Labbe Chro.

Anno 1537.

only excepted) as the Pope himself had, according to the ancient Canons. But now, as matters were ordered at *Trent*, if she had sent any thither and if they had been admittable otherwise, yet they must not sit there without owning the Pope in his Legate. They must not only be joyned into one Body with him, but they must acknowledge him for their representative Head, who yet to them was no other than a man dead in Law. For they knew him to be condemned for a Traytor, by that Authority to which they were Subjects, as well at *Trent* as in *England*. And though the Popes placing him there in that Character was the highest Affront that could be done to the Justice of their Nation; yet they must submit, nay, contribute to that Affront, by owning him in that Character, or else they must have no place in that Council. This Contumelious Condition being implicitly imposed on our Bishops, was a virtual Exclusion of them from their Right of sitting there. And it was so contrived, that it lookt as ill upon the State as on the Church.

The King was not only concerned for both these, but also for Himself on another account; having his Cause to be heard there, if it had been a General Council. It was an Injury to him all this while, that he had None, so long after his Appeal to it. But now to make him amends, he had a Council pack'd by his Adversary; and if that were not enough, he had this Traiterous Subject in the Head of it. Which last thing went beyond all former Trials of his Patience, and perhaps had been enough to have angered the meekest

of Princes. If it be an ill thing to have ones Judge chosen by his Enemy, it is worse to have his Enemy be his Judge. He had both in this Council, as the Pope had ordered it for him. Therefore as he could not be Canonically obliged to stand by it, so he did but use his own Right, as before in Protestings, so now in Declaring against it. He did it on all Occasions, and continued so doing till his Death.

His Son *Edward VI.* who reigned next, kept the Pope at his distance; and had many things reformed in the Church, of which I shall not speak particularly, because, all that he did of this kind was soon after undone by his Successour Queen *Mary*. She, for reasons that I mentioned (i) before, restored the Pope's Authority in this Kingdom. And, though his Council of *Trent* was all her time in adjournment, so that she could not send her Bishops thither, yet she had it acknowledged by them in a (k) Synod, where Cardinal *Pool* (being first restored in blood) had the honour to preside as his Legate.

But as to the Schism between us and the *Roman* Church, both these Princes were unconcerned in the Original cause of it, which was (as I have shewn) the Popes Sentence concerning their Fathers Marriage. For *Edward VI.* was born to him by another Wife, whom he had married after *Katharines* death. And Queen *Mary*, being his Daughter by *Katharine*, was not aggrieved by the Sentence, but on the contrary held her self righted by it. The only Person aggrieved was Queen *Elizabeth*, the Daughter of *Henry VIII.* by *Anne Boleyn*; whose Marriage the Pope had (i) declared to

^a Pag. 85.

^k Pag. 8, 9.

ⁱ *Sand. de Schif.*
p. 68. b.

be

be Null, and pronounced any fruit that should come of it to be Illegitimate. This Queen being the only fruit of that Marriage, the Sentence was injurious to her, if to any. And whether she was wrong'd in it or no, it ought to have been tried before a *Lawful General Council*, to whose Judgment her Father had Appealed, as has been (*m*) already shewn. Pa. 97, 98. And there being no such Council held in his life time, the right of his Appeal descended to her at his death. She was now the only party concerned in the Cause, and her Right could not be given from her by any other. She was as much concerned, as ever her Father was, to be heard by the Judge to whom He had Appealed; and to be Righted against the Pope, if it should appear that he had injured her; and also against his Council of Trent, which abetted him in it. And she had as much Reason as ever her Father had, to disobey and to resist both the Pope and his Council, till they would suffer such a Council to meet as was the only proper Judge of her Cause.

Thus far all that has been said of her Father, except only in things of Personal concernment, is as Applicable to her. And more needs not be said, to shew that they were neither of them guilty of Schism, in asserting their Cause, as they did, against the Adversaries of it. For therein they did no more than what they lawfully might, and ought to do, according to the Principles of the Western Church.

But there was something in her Case, which was not in her Fathers, and which would have cleared her

her of Schism, though he had been guilty of it. For whereas, when he rejected the Pope and his Council, he was wholly of their mind in all the Articles of Faith then in being; She did it, not till the Council had sate, and till they had already made sundry new Articles of Faith. Whereof the first were defined (*n*) some months before her Father died. However he might like them, as they presume he did, who (*o*) tell us that he died in their Faith; yet it is certain that (though at some time she did not shew it,) she did always dislike them, her Enemies being Judges. And as soon as she came into Power, she declared, they were so far from being any part of her Faith, that she took them for no other than False and Novel opinions. If she mistook in so judging, which shall be considered in its place, then she was at least materially an Heretic. And such he must prove her to have been that will make her a Schismatick. For if she was in the right, and those Doctrines were not of Faith, then the Schism occasioned by them must not lie at her door. It must be charged on the Council who defined them, and on the Pope who added them to the Creed, who made the belief and profession of these Doctrines, a condition without which there is no living in his Communion. She did what she ought to do, in refusing to have it on those terms, in adhering to *the Faith once delivered to the Saints*, and in rejecting the Authority which would have it defiled with those Mixtures.

What has been said may suffice to clear Queen Elizabeth from the Imputation of Schism, on any Personal

a *Enc. Trid.*

Sess. 4.

An. 1546.

April 8.

• *Supra* p. 91.

Sand. de Schif.

p. 129.

Personal account, in not obeying the Pope or his Council. It appears that she was free from Schism in that matter; as well in *Foro Ecclesie*, having the Canonical right of an Appeal against them; as in *Foro Conscientie*, because what she did, was to keep her Faith pure from their undue Impositions.

Whether she can be cleared as well on the account of her Government in Ecclesiastical matters, this we ought to consider as a thing that more immediately concerns us. For we date the Reformation of our Church from the beginning of her Reign. And though we have a Prescription since, of above a hundred years; which is enough to secure us against the Claims of the Papacy, in the Judgment of them that hold it to be only of Humane Right, as all men ought to do upon those grounds above mentioned; yet, to them of the Roman Communion, it will perhaps be more satisfactory, if it appear, that beside the Right that we have now from Prescription, there was also an Original Right in our Reformers to do what they did in the beginning of the Reformation.

The first thing they did, was to assert the Queens Supremacy; from whence they proceeded to settle the Church Government; and ended with the Reformation of Worship and Doctrine.

I. First, of what she did in assuming the Supremacy, more needs not be said than to make it be understood. And we cannot understand her meaning in it better than by her own declaration and practice. She (p) declared that she took no other power to her self, than what Anciently belonged to

she

V.B. Spér-
 78W's Collecti-
 on.

XXXIX
 Articles.
 Art. 37.

the Crown of England, that is, immediately under God to govern her people of all sorts, as well the Clergy as the Laity. And she exercised no other Power or Jurisdiction over the Church than what was merely External, as appears (q) by her Injunctions and other Acts. Though if she had exercised any other power than what she claimed, it had been only an Act of Misgovernment in her, for which she was accountable to God; and the Church had not therefore been guilty of Schism, since it (r) gave her no other power, nor owned her in the exercise of any other, than what is above-mentioned. And that power is so inherent in every Supreme Magistrate, and so necessary for the well-being of the People, that we cannot deny the right of it in them to whom we grant the Supreme Magistracy it self.

Wheresoever any Prince or State have seemed to think so ill of themselves as if they were not so fit, as a Foreiner was, to be trusted with this Power over their own People; or rather where they have been so obsequious to the Pope as to take this Flower out of their own Crown and put it into the Triple: It may be every where observed, that either they or their Successors have found occasion, at some time or other, to call for it home again, or to use it as if they had not given it from themselves. We may see examples of this, in *Germany* in *Ockham's* days, in *Spain* under the Emperour *Charles V*, and in *Venice* at the time of the Interdict. But especially in *France*; where the *Gallican* Church is obliged to justify this Right of Princes, unless she will grant that her most Christian Kings

Kings have been in Schism, more than once, and especially, while they stood to the pragmatic Sanction.

But we need not go abroad for examples, having so many at home, and such as are very full to our purpose. He that will, may see them (f) elsewhere gathered to his hand. And I have (s) mentioned enough to shew that even in Popish times our Princes were not ignorant of their Right, and that between whiles they were fain to assert it, in such terms as did import, though they did not name, a Supremacy. But as their Laws did not expressly mention the word, so neither did they always stand by their Laws. When they had made them, the Pope still found some device or other to make them ineffectual. Till King *Henry VIII.* having thrown out the Pope, for those reasons above mentioned; did by (u) advice of his Council and Bishops, take both the Power and the Title on himself; whether he took more than his due, let others judge. As I am not engaged to defend all that he assumed, so I need not, for so much as Queen *Mary* exercised of it. For it is agreed, (and there was great (x) reason for it,) that she was always (y) for the Popes Supremacy in her heart, (though for fear of her life she (z) renounced it when time was.) And yet she no sooner came to the Crown, but she exercised the Supremacy her self, in changing most (a) of the Bishops, and Reforming (b) what she held to be Abuses in the Church. Afterward when she had surrendered it to the Pope, yet she did not so wholly put it out of her self, but that, when He

Q displeased

See Sir Roger Twiss's Collection of them in his Vindication. Supra p. 18, 45.

L. Herbert. P. 408.

Supra p. 45. Sand. de Schism. p. 134. 2 Camd. Elise.

She puts out thirteen Bishops. Fox Acts and Mon. 1280. 60. 1282. 50. and 1332. 20, 80.

^c *Fall. Church Hist.* 18 §. 3. displeased her, she could (*c*) shut his Legate out of her Kingdom. So that to adjust the matter between the two Sisters, in this point of Supremacy, they seem to have differed only thus: One adjudged it to the Pope, and yet took it from him when she pleased; the other thought it belonged to the Crown, and therefore kept it wholly to her self.

2. What Queen *Elizabeth* did in settling Church matters, was founded on her Right in the Supremacy. By vertue whereof, she took upon her to Reform abuses in the Church, as her Sister Queen *Mary* had done. And I believe that whosoever compares their proceedings, will find, that she took more leisure and advice than Queen *Mary*, in doing it. For before a Parliament (*d*) sate, she had gone only thus (*e*) far, that she allowed her people some of the Church Offices in a Language which they all understood. Afterward by advice of her Parliament (*f*) she restored King *Edwards* Laws, and repealed those which had been made by Queen *Mary* for Ecclesiastical matters. And by those Laws she abolished the Popish Mass, and restored the whole Communion to the Laity; whereas her Sister had done the contrary, (*g*) without Law, by her mere Right of Supremacy. Which Right she having afterwards given away by Act of Parliament, (though still she used it when she saw cause,) Queen *Elizabeth* thought fit to have it restored by Act of Parliament; (or rather *Re-declared*, for the Act (*h*) was not Operative but Declarative.) And whereas by this Act it was required, that all Bishops, and others that held any Church-

* 1555. Jan. 23

* *Camd. Eliz.*
p. 39.

* *Ibid.* p. 25.

* *P. Supra.*

* *V. Bramhall's*
Vindication.
p. 86.

Church-living in this Kingdom, should take an Oath of Supremacy, as we call it, or else should be incapable of holding any such Church preferment: on refusal of this Oath there were turned out thirteen Bishops. I note the number, the rather, because there had been just so many of the Protestant Bishops turned out by Queen *Mary*. There appears to have been some difference between the turning out, of these by Law, and of those without any Law then in force. But there was more in the cause of their suffering; those being outed for matters purely Religious, and these for a Civil cause, for refusing an Oath lawfully imposed. Which Oath did not truly concern their Religion, even themselves being Judges. For they had all, or most of them, (i) taken it before; some of them had taken it many times over; two or three of them had writ in defence of it, nay, were at the first composing of it. But there was a greater difference than either of these, if the Bishops, then turned out by Queen *Elizabeth*, had been most of them Canonically deprived under King *Edward VI*, and were never since Canonically restored, which may deserve a further Consideration. The mean while it is certain that this Act outed not (k) two hundred more of all the Clergy in this Kingdom. And their places being filled with such as had been banished in Queen *Maries* days, it is not hard to judge how all things else to be done in Church matters might pass any Obstruction, as they did, afterwards in full Convocation.

3. As to Doctrinal things, it was generally observed in those times, by the Advantage of

ⁱ *Camd. Eliz.*
^{p. 41.}
Bonner, Tunstall,
and Thurlby.

ⁱ *Camd. Eliz.*
^{p. 36.}

³ *Supra* p. 6, 7.

² *Ann* 1562.

Ecclesiastical learning, that in those many former Ages which wanted it, many errors, and some very gross ones, had crept into the Church. And those errors, having the Papacy on their side, for (1) Reasons which I have already shewn, had so far prevailed, that they were growing to be Articles of Faith. Many of them were already defined so, and more were like to be by the Council of *Trent*. Therefore now the Church of *England*, being free from the Yoke of the Papacy, and having an Absolute Power to act for her self, thought fit to use the Right of a National Church, that is, to Reform her self by declaring against those errors, and to rid Christianity from them here in *England*, without taking upon her to prescribe to other Churches. And withal she thought it needful to set such bounds to the Reformation, that men might not, by their heats against Popery, be transported so far as to run into contrary errors. For these causes that famous Summary of Christian Doctrines, which we call the XXXIX *Articles*, was drawn up, and approved by (m) Convocation.

The Compiling and Publishing of these Articles was properly the Act of the Church of *England*. And these Articles being many of them opposed to those Doctrines which the Roman Church holds to be of Faith, and being either *in Terminis*, or at least in the sense of them, the same which their *Trent* Council hath branded with Heresie; it is therefore evident that, upon the account of these Doctrines, neither the Queen nor Church of *England* can be justly charged with Schism,

Schism, unless the Doctrines themselves are first proved to be Heretical, as they are judged by those decrees of the *Trent* Council.

For the trial of these Doctrines, they will not allow our Church that resort which she would make immediately to the Scriptures. And we cannot go along with the Roman Church whither she would have us; that is, to the Council of *Trent*, or, which is all one to the judgment of their present Church. Therefore there is no possible way to end disputes, but by some known equal Standard between us. And that can be no other than *Catholic Tradition*. Which they of the *Roman* side cannot well decline; for it is that from which the Council of *Trent* has (*n*) pretended to receive all her Doctrines. Nor have we any cause to decline it; for the Primitive Fathers, who were the Original Conveighers of this Tradition, did profess to know no other Faith than what was contained in the Scriptures.

• Conc. Trident. .
Sess. 4.

Why we cannot stand to the judgment of the Council of *Trent* for the trial of our Doctrines, we have all the same Reasons that they have in the French Church, why they reject it in matters of Discipline. That is, if they deny it to have the Authority of a General Council; the English, though of their Communion, may as well deny it to have Infallibility. Nay, much more this than the other. For we may give to whom we please an Authority over us; but we cannot give Infallibility to any, but to them to whom God has promised it, that is, if to any Council, to such a one as represents the whole diffusive Church. And we have

have one reason more than the French have, and which signifies more than all theirs, to shew that, though they did, yet, we ought not to look upon this as such a Council. For the French Church was represented at *Trent*, in some sort, though they were not at all satisfied with it; but Ours neither was Represented, nor could be, (as I have shewn,) neither after nor before the Reformation.

* *Crisp's Ep.*
Apol. n. 132.

And though (as it is (o) said) the French have since received the Doctrinal Decrees of that Council; that is, they have allowed them to be Antecedently true; in those Terms in which the Council defined them, though not a whit the more true for having been defined in that Council; ours cannot pretend that here in *England* it ever had so much as that lowest Degree of Reception.

Before the Reformation of which we now speak, that is, before the beginning of Queen *Elizabeth's* reign, the Council of *Trent* had fate not much more than half its Sessions. And though it was quoted with respect by the Synod of (p) *London* in Queen *Mary's* days, yet it does not appear that there was then any Formal Reception of the Council. Nor if there had been, could that have obliged aftercomers to receive whatsoever should pass afterward in that Council? Thus much, I think, ought to be considered by them (if there be any) that hold themselves obliged by that Synod. But much less would it have signified to our Reformers, who did not hold themselves obliged by that Synod. For beside that they differed in point of Faith, they

† *Supra*, p. 8, 9.

they had other Canonical Objections against it: That it was composed of Bishops who had been Deprived (as was said,) in King *Edwards* days, and had not been duly Restored since, for ought that appears. And it was Headed by the Popes Legate, in that Quality, as representing Him against whom they had an Appeal yet in force. Now to him that considers the Case in these Circumstances, it cannot seem reasonable, that King *Edwards* Bishops should have thought themselves obliged by the Synodical Act of them that sate there in their Injury; or that they, who adhered to their Appeal from the Pope, should be concluded by any thing that passed under his Legate.

Since the Reformation, it cannot be imagined that the Council of *Trent* should be received, here in *England*, by any other than by them of the Roman Communion. And whether they have Received it, or no, they best know. But if they have, it must be their own voluntary Act; for no power whatsoever could oblige them to receive it. If any could, it must be, either the Council it self, or the Pope by his Universal Authority: But for the Popes Power, they understand themselves so well, that they know he cannot oblige them to the reception of a Council. For he cannot bring them under what Government he pleases; I say, not without their own Consent; as they have judged, and shewed it by their practice. When he empowered an Archbishop to govern them, the Seculars would not receive him. And when he would have placed a Bishop over them, the Regu-
lars

lars would not receive him. So the Seculars and Regulars, as it were with one consent, have given us their Judgment in the Case; and that by no Indeliberate Act on either hand, for they contended about it a great part of the last Age. And therefore, unless their Principles are altered since, the same Right which they exercised in not submitting to a Government, they may exercise as well in not receiving a Council, though the Pope should presume to impose it. And that the Council, of it self, has no power to oblige them, it appears in that judged case of the *Egyptian Church*. The Bishops whereof would not subscribe to a Decree of the (9) Fourth General Council, because they had then no Archbishop to give them an Authority for it. This was allowed to be a *Reasonable* excuse, though the Decree, which they were to have subscribed, was in a matter of Faith. I suppose they of the Roman Communion, here in *England*, have had the same Reason ever since the Reformation. They have had no lawful Primate, nor no declared Bishops all this while. And during this imperfect state of their Church, if there had been a General Council, and any of their Clergy had been there, they might have been excused from subscribing, though in matters of Faith. What difference there is in the Case, makes wholly on our side. For there is a wide difference indeed between Subscribing and Receiving. The first is only the declaring ones own personal assent to the Decrees of any Council; the other is to give them the force of Laws in the National Church. And if (according to that Canon,)
the

¶ *Conc. Chalced.*
Can. 30. in the
Codex Canonum
universæ Eccle-
siæ, and in
Basiliens III.
P. 447. E. Edit.
Paris. An. 1636

the Bishops, where they are in a Council, are not bound to subscribe without their Primate; how much less can any National Church be Obligated to receive things for Law without her Bishops; Nay more, how can she Lawfully receive them? Especially, such a Church, as owns there is no Jurisdiction without Bishops. She cannot do it without a Synod of Bishops according to the ancient Canons. And therefore the English Church of Roman Catholics is so far from being bound to receive the *Trent* Council, that, in her present condition, she could not Lawfully receive it. I say still, according to the ancient Canons, which ought to be of some force with them of the Roman Communion.

But let them ~~do~~ as they please. The case is plain, that the Reformed Church of *England* ought not to receive it, if she can prove her charge, that that Council has innovated in the Christian Faith; or rather unless that Council can discharge her self of it, by proving that what we call her New Faith, is not new, but received from Catholick Tradition. We think we are sure they cannot bring this Tradition for those Doctrines which are laid as Foundations for all the rest in that Council; namely, their making unwritten Tradition to be of Divine Authority, and therefore equal with the holy Scriptures; their bringing those which we call the Apocryphal Books, into the Canon of Scripture; their making the Vulgar Latine Translation Authentick in all matters of Faith and good life.

For these, and all the rest of their Doctrines of

R

Faith,

Faith, as they are called in the Roman Church, which we call Innovations and Errors, We are not afraid to refer our selves to Catholic Tradition. If they of the *Roman* side would submit to it as well, there would be no difference between us, in matters of Faith, whatsoever there might be in Opinion. And therefore they would have no cause in their own private judgment to conclude us for Heretics; much less would they find us condemned for such by any competent Judicature.

If they think otherwise than we do in this matter, the reason must be, because they do not mean what we do by Catholic Tradition. It is plain that too many of that Church have a wrong notion of it; taking that for Catholic Tradition, which is only presumed to be so by a Party in these latter Ages. For though they call themselves the Catholic Church, and perhaps really take themselves to be no other, yet they are but a handful to the body of Christians; especially considered in our notion of Catholic, which, as we take it, extends to all the Christians of all Ages. We plainly profess to take the Catholic Tradition in that sense of *Vincentius Lyrinensis*, and before him of *Tertullian* in his Prescriptions; who make this to be the Standard of all Doctrines of Faith, *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*. First, that which has gone for Christian Faith in all Ages from the beginning of Christianity. Secondly, which has been taken for such by the whole *diffuse Church*, comprehending all those particular Churches which have not been Canonically condemned

demned either of Schism or Hereſie. And laſtly, that which has not only been the Faith of ſome perſons, though contradicted by others, but that which has been the conſtant belief of the generality in all thoſe Chriſtian Churches. To bring our differences to this ſtandard betwixt us, I conceive that, firſt, they of the Roman Communion will not find ſuch evidence for their Articles of Faith, as they think of, in the Primitive Records. I ſay, ſuch evidence as will make it appear that they were of Faith, antecedently to the Definitions of Councils. They will find that thoſe Councils, which firſt defined them to be of Faith, were not ſuch againſt which we have no juſt exception, nor that their Definitions have been generally received throughout the diffuſive Catholic Church.

For the *Primitive Records*, I ſuppoſe, they of the Roman Church, that have read them, will ſcarce pretend to ſhew how they convey all thoſe Articles to us, as of Faith. And where they fail to ſhew this, of any Article, they muſt excuſe us if we cannot allow it to be a Catholic Tradition. Much more, when we ſhew, from thoſe Records, that there are ſtrong preſumptions to the contrary. Whereof, not to trouble my Reader with more inſtances, I have given ſome (a) proof in that which *Bellarmino* calls *Caput Fidei*, namely, in that Doctrin of the Popes Supremacy over all Chriſtians. Pa. 81, &c.

For the *Councils*, by which their new Articles have been defined, the moſt they can rationally pretend to by their Definitions, is, to deliver the

sense of the present diffusive Church. Which they are presumed to do, when they have power to represent it, or when their Decrees are received in all parts of it, and not otherwise. But how few of their General Councils can pretend to either of these Conditions? It appears, that the Eldest of them could not, I mean (b) the Second Council of *Nice*, which first imposed the worship of Images. For, about thirty years before, there was (c) an Eastern Council held at *Constantinople*, which Condemned that very thing. And, not ten years after, there was (d) a Western Council at *Frankford*, which condemned this *Nicene* Council for imposing it. Neither of these Councils can be said to have been less Orthodox than that Council was, in any point but that which they opposed. And their very Opposing it shews, that, at those times, it was not the sense either of the Eastern or of the Western Church. When that Council obtained in the Eastern Church, yet still it was opposed by the Western; and however there also the practice crept in, yet that Council has never been received in the Western Church, as hath been lately proved by a *most learned Writer. Nor has Image-worship been defined by any other Council, that could be said to Represent both the Eastern and Western Church.

In all Ages since, the Councils which have defined any Articles, have been but Western Councils at best, For, though some Greek Bishops were present at one or two of them, yet, what they consented to was never ratified by the Greek Church. And for these Western Councils, to give them

† *Anno 787.*
Conc. Nic. II.
 said to be of
 350 Bishops.

* *Anno 754.*
Conc. Const.
 of 338 Bishops.

‡ *Anno 794.*
Conc. Frankf.
 of about 300.

* *Dr. Stilling-*
fleet in answer
 to T. G. p. 812.
 to p. 838.

them their due, it was not so much their fault, if they lead us into Error, as it is ours, if we follow them in it. For he that reads them, and knows the History of their times, will not chuse them for Guides, if he has any care of that trust which God has given him of himself.

He cannot but see, that, bating the three last of those Councils, which have not that Authority in the French Church, nor with some other of that Communion; all the rest were held in times of such palpable Ignorance, that when they went amiss they could not well see how to do otherwise. Their Bishops could not but be generally unqualified to judge of matters of Faith. For they had a great want of good Books, and of the Languages in which they were written. I speak of those Books that are now chiefly used in all Questions of Faith, as well by their as by our Writers. And sure they that had them not to use, could not but be miserably to seek in all those parts of knowledge which are Absolutely necessary for any one that should judge of those matters. Namely, those without which they could not Ordinarily know, neither the true sense of holy Scripture, nor the Judgments of Councils and Fathers, nor the Practice of the Primitive Church. We find by the best of their Writers in those times that they were so much to seek in those most needful things, that not a Colledge in either of our Universities can be said without scandal to know no more in them than one of those Councils.

If instead of those last we bate four other of their Councils, which are disowned by the Papalins,
for

* *Supra* p. 88. for reasons which have been already * given; all the rest were in such Bondage to the Papacy, that they had not the power to do otherwise than they did. Their Bishops, by Pope *Hildebrand's* device, were all sworn to maintain the *Royalities of St. Peter*; (e) whereof one was, that *the Pope's Faith could not fail*. And being assured of that, as men should be of things which they swear, their wisest course, when matters of Faith came before them, was to trust the Pope's Judgment, and pass every thing as he brought it to their hands. This way therefore they took, and it saved them the trouble of Examination and Debate, and such like *Conciliary* proceedings. It may be worth the observing, that in Seven General Councils, which they reckon from the time of Pope *Hildebrand* downward, among the many Doctrines which they are said to have Defined, there is not one that appears to have cost them any more but the Hearing. The Pope had them brought and read before the Council, as if that was enough to make them their Acts as well as (f) His. And this was the constant course, till the Papacy was weakened by a long and scandalous Schism; Then those Councils which made themselves superiour to the Pope, thought fit to use their Own Judgment, such as it was; and they proceeded Conciliarly, as Councils had done in former times. Which way being more for the credit of their Definitions, it was continued in those Councils which restored the Pope to his Supremacy; with this difference only, that whereas those Seven Councils above-mentioned passed all things

e V. *Greg. VII.*
distata.

f Hence the
Style of those
Decrees;
Alex. in Conc.
Lateran.
Innocent. in
Conc. Lateran.
&c.

things in the Lump which the Pope or his Ministers brought before them; the Councils since have passed them Piecemeal; with some shew of using their own Judgment in every particular, though in truth with so entire a resignation to the Pope, that nothing could ever pass against his Interest, or his will, even when they seemed most to endeavour it. So that, in all these Councils, whatsoever has passed in determining Doctrines of Faith, is in truth no more than a Papal Decree, though it bears the name, and perhaps has some shew of a Councils Definition.

Lastly, for the Judgment of the Diffusive Church, we are not ignorant that many of the things thus imposed, (of which we can find no mention in Antiquity, and which we know were first started long after the beginnings of Christianity) yet have been received as well by Greeks as by the Latines in latter Ages. But, not to say by what means they obtained it, we cannot forget what Ages those were, in which these things came to gain such an Authority among Christians. They were such as learned men of the Roman Communion, who are acquainted with the Writers of those times, (I say as well with the Greek as Latine Writers,) do not at all reverence their Judgments apart, whatsoever they think of them together in Councils. And according to the Rule prescribed by those *Fathers*, it will not pass for the Judgment of the Catholic diffusive Church, though both Greeks and Latines agree in it, and have done so for some Ages together. There must be *semper*, as well as *ubique*, and *ab omnibus*. Though
the

the two last conditions may suffice to make us think any Doctrine to be true, or at least the Error in it not to be Damnable; yet to make us believe it is a Doctrine of Faith, there must be *semper* likewise, without which it is no Catholic Tradition.

It is surely a great Affront to the Catholic Church, and to the great *Author and finisher of her Faith*, that, as if that *Faith once delivered* were Insufficient, there must be new things added to it from time to time, by a Succession of men that take upon them to be his *Vicars*, without making out any colourable title to that Office. And, though we find no such things in the Ancient Records of his Church; though we see these are framed to support the new Authority of those Vicars, and though we know how they abused the Ignorance and Tameness of many Ages; yet because in those Ages these things were generally received, and have mellowed some time since in the Faith of them that knew no better, they are pleased to use this as an Argument, not only why others must be concluded and bound for ever to sit down by their Judgment, who had little, and used none; but why they must also receive all things else that are imposed in like manner, under pretence that this is now the Judgment of the Diffusive Church.

But the case is much worse, these new things being imposed on the Church with a pretence of Infallibility. Which Infallibility being a word of good sound, some that are no Papalins, but hold with them in some Doctrines which they cannot well prove otherwise, strike in with them at this, though

though the sound is all that they agree in. For whereas the Papalins mean an Infallibility of Judgment, and place it in the Virtual Church; these mean only an Infallibility of Tradition, and that they place in the Diffusive Church. They would persuade us that it is a Demonstrable thing, that those things that are believed, as of Faith, in this Age, could never be otherwise. They may as well Demonstrate, that a Tale does not mend with often telling, or that no change can be made by insensible degrees. But the Authors of this being Censured at *Rome* for it, we have no more to say to them till they make it appear that they are of the Roman Church in spite of her Censures. For our dispute is at present with them of the Roman Church; who pretend that this Infallibility is in theirs, that is the Virtual Church. They say that she has it by virtue of Divine Assistance; which being either without or above means, it is all one as if they said she has a New Revelation. And one would think that they intended no other who founded their Definitions on Miracles. Now if they can prove that any such Assistance was promised to the Virtual Church, and if they can prove that they are the Church to which those promises were made; or if they can prove their Credentials to be the same that Christ gave to his Apostles; then we must grant that we are out, in denying this Infallibility. Otherwise they must grant that their virtual Church might be mistaken. And if she might, we have reason to think that she was so in these matters. And if it is but colourably said, that she was mistaken in matters of so very

great moment, there is reason to think that those matters are fit for a Review. To which the Greeks may submit, and so may all other Christians that differ among themselves; but they of the Roman Church cannot, while they keep up their claim to Infallibility.

If we must (as the Roman Court will have it) be called Heretics for not submitting to new Revelation, we cannot help it. Nor need we much trouble our selves. For we know we are no Hereticks by any Law Divine or Humane, except those which this new Power has made to fence in its new Doctrines. And we know they cannot, with any colour of Reason from Catholic Tradition, think us Heretics themselves, while we hold to the Positive Doctrines of our Church. So that when they are pleased to give us this Title, we can take their meaning to be only this: They declare us to be, as indeed we are, the Enemies of that Monarchy to which they would enthral the whole Church of Christ; They do as good as tell us what we are to expect for this, if ever (for our sins) God should suffer us to fall into their hands; They would have their people hate us the mean while, and avoid all communication with us, for fear they should come to know how we are wronged in this matter.

This appears to be the sense and design of the Interested men. And yet we doubt not there are many others among them, who either have no such Interest, or who will not give themselves to be led by it. We have reason to believe this, partly from what we observe at this present, and much more

more from what we read of former times. Of all Nations that continue in the Roman Communion, the more any have flourished in Learning and Civility, the more free they have kept themselves from all that which is properly Popery: while the more Ignorant, and therefore more Superstitious Nations, are so fond of it, that, for want of this, they will scarce allow the other to be Catholics. But for Protestants, whom the other can endure to live among them, though perhaps in no desirable condition; These will not allow them to live in their Country, unless that may be called Living, when men are buried alive in the Inquisition.

So it may be observed among Persons of that Communion. The most busie and imposing, the most fierce and untreatable Bigots, are commonly they that scarce understand their own Prayers. Learned men either have not those heats, or else govern them better. Unless they be such as are engaged to the Papacy by preferment, or by the hopes of it, or by the Vows of their Orders; or perhaps such as having forsaken our Church, will not allow us to Question either their Wisdom or their Honesty in it. We are not ordinarily to expect so much as common Civility from such men. But they that have no particular Quarrel against us, and are otherwise of a Candid and Ingenuous temper; especially when they have Learning with it, as not a few have, and would to God there were more in the Roman Church; These men being not averse from inquiring into Truth, nor from receiving it when it is brought before them,

if they do not see how they can prove us Heretics, and that their Proof is as strong and clear as the Charge is heavy, they will not think it a sufficient Reason to call us so because others have done it. Nor will they think fit to debar us the common Right of all Christians, that is, to be heard what we can say for our selves: And that either before a competent Judicature, if it may be had; or if that cannot be, yet at least by all them that will judge of us.

I know no reason to doubt, that if all of them knew but so much of our Church as has been said, and if they considered it with that Impartiality which we ought to expect from such men, it would work some good effect in no small number of them in that Communion. And that effect would appear upon such a Review as I have mentioned; I mean, that we should have Right done us in a free General Council, if the Pope would permit it to be held in our Age, or rather if all Christian Princes would agree to call it themselves, and not wait for His time, which will benever:

But though he will not suffer this Reason to be done us abroad, where it should be in a Common Assembly of Christians; yet he cannot hinder us from having it at home, at least in the private Judgment of them that do not fear his Censures. I have shewn that this is like to be the fruit of a Discrimination. It will try who they are. And for them chiefly I intended this Digression. In which I have been the more large, because I think it no Digression, but rather the best way for the suppressing of Popery in this Kingdom, to get our Church
to

to be better understood by all among us of that Communion. And surely, if they did rightly understand it, wise men would consider how they made themselves guilty of Heresie and Schism by unjustly charging us with those crimes. How of *Heresie*, by joyning with them that have made such Additions to the Faith: And of *Schism*, in charging us with Heresie for not receiving those Additions; and thereupon separating themselves from our Communion. They that shall be convinced of their danger in both these, will endeavour to avoid it, by relinquishing that Foreign Power, which they can think themselves no way obliged to, if they better consider it. And finding themselves free from any such obligation, I do not see what should hinder them from joyning themselves to that National Church in which God has sufficiently provided all things necessary for their Salvation.

Though if they stay where they are, it may perhaps be better for Us upon Politic accounts; which I add as my last instance of the Benefit that we may expect from this Discrimination.

It would be no small Benefit to us, if such men continuing in the Roman Communion would but keep the Popish Party from being more united, and more active against us. And thus much they would do for us, though they did not intend it. But they will do much more, and that with full Intention, unless their Opposition to us weigh more with them than their care of themselves. For they will find themselves Obligated, if they consider it, as well in Duty as Interest, and no less obliged both

both ways then we are, to keep out the Foreign Power from coming in among us. Their obligation in Conscience will be the same that ours is, and so much more if they are bound to it by Oath, whatsoever the Oath shall be, that is designed for their Discrimination. And as to Interest, it will be much more theirs than it is ours, to keep out the Common Enemy, that will be heavy to us both, but much heavier to them than to us. For as they are fewer in Number, so they are better known in their Persons, and therefore the more easie to be found out. And being found; if ever that day should come, which God avert; though we must look to feel Rods, they are sure to be punished with Scorpions. The provocation which they have given already has been more than most of us have been able to give: And when we are gone, if they continue, the Roman Court having no other Adversaries, would be the more intent and the more able to root them out of the Kingdom. I do not say this to waken them that are most concerned to think of it; for I suppose they cannot sleep, having so great a Danger before their eyes. And if they should happen to forget themselves, they would be wakened by those Censures of which enough has been spoken already. It is at present more needful to make our own People (who do not so well understand the Common Adversary, as not having had the same Experience of him,) to be sensible how much they are concerned not to lose any Help that can be had. And therefore that it is our Interest as well as theirs, to preserve such a Party of useful men, and to oblige them to joyn with

with us against him. Which can be done no other way but by a Discrimination.

I cannot think there is any Protestant among us, who will not for these, or other the like, Considerations, think fit to use the Moderation here proposed, and endeavour to promote it in others as far as he is able. Unless he may perhaps be discouraged by some other Considerations, that may make it seem not so Practicable as it were to be desired. For if it can be put in practice, I think no wise and good man, having weighed the reasons here given, will deny that it ought to be; and that as well in Prudence, as in Justice, to preserve both Church, and State, and whatsoever is dear to us in this Nation.

The things chiefly alledged against the Practicableness of it, are these that follow. I shall first name them, and then consider the Consequence of them. First, It is alledged that all they of the Roman Church are obliged by their Principles to follow the Judgment of the Roman Court: And that they Actually follow it, in those very things which are *Papery* in the proper signification. Secondly, If any of them deny this, or declare and promise the contrary, we can have no Assurance of what they say; they have so many ways to elude all such Promises and Declarations; especially being made to *Hereticks*, as they are taught to call us. Thirdly, Though we have a sufficient assurance of any persons at present, that they are No *Papists*, yet while they are of that Communion, they are in a continual danger to be seduced, or change their minds; and whensoever that happens, (as it may before we are aware of it,)

Objections
against the
practicable-
ness of this
Discrimina-
tion.

it,) they will be able to do us the more hurt, through our relying on the security which they have given us.

I confess there is a force in these Objections, which I cannot so well avoid, but that they who are chiefly concerned to have them answered may suspect that I use some kind of Prevarication; because I do not answer them their way, or not say all that they think their Cause will bear. To secure my self against that most odious Imputation; I do in the first place declare that I shall omit nothing which I think to be material, though I do not pretend to say all they have to say for themselves. And then for their Way of answering: If they think they can Justifie themselves against the charge that is implied in those mentioned Allegations, and that they can thereby entitle themselves as well to Trust as to Protection; I confess this is more than I can do for them. And therefore I take so much lower; Endeavouring to excuse the persons as far as they are capable to be excused from those things which are not to be Justified in their Cause; and since the Law has excluded them from Trust, for such Reasons as cannot but continue as long as the established Religion, I shall yet endeavour to shew that they safely may and ought to have Protection, while they give such assurance of their Loyalty as they are capable to give, and no otherwise.

* Considerations of present Concernment. 1675.

I shall do it with much the more ease, having the matter prepared to my hand in a Book * that was published about two years since, to this purpose. Where the Objections being proved as to
matter

matter of Fact, and the Inferences drawn with great evidence and strength; if I should not extract enough to satisfy the Reader in either kind I shall however satisfy my self, that I have made him amends by recommending the Book to him, where he may find those things said at large, and with very great accurateness, which either cannot so well be contracted, or I cannot do it here, without exceeding the brevity which I design.

First, Whereas all Roman Catholics are said to be obliged by their principles to follow the Judgment of the Roman Court; I find little less than Demonstration for this, in a * Book lately published. Where it is proved that they cannot justify their calling themselves *Catholics* exclusively to all other Christians, any otherwise than by resolving their Faith into the Infallibility of the Roman Church as united to the Pope; that is, really, into the Infallibility of the Pope as being Head of the Church. So that if he declare, as it is evident he has done, that those things which we call Popery are Articles of Faith, they are bound (if they will do things consequently to their Principles) either to believe him in those Articles, or else to relinquish that Communion. This follows by good Reasoning; though that way of proof is not so clear to a Vulgar Capacity, as that which is drawn from Authority, and appears in plain instances of Fact. But what greater Instance can there be of this kind, than the practice of the whole Roman Church, which has actually followed the Judgment of the Roman Court, and that in things which are properly Popery?

I. The Roman Church and Court not differing in their Principles.
* H. Dodwell of the fundamental Principle of Popery.

T

By

By the whole Roman Church, I mean that which they call so themselves; that is, the governing part of the Clergy of all the Churches of that Communion; that part which acts for all the rest in Ecclesiastical matters, and by whose Acts all their Subjects are obliged according to their own Principles. Now taking Popery (as I have (a) defined it) to be the owning of the Pope's pretended Authority; whether in Spirituals, over the Universal Church, or in Temporals, over all Princes and States; it hath been proved that this Roman Church owns this Doctrine in both the branches of it.

First, in *Spirituals*, there can be no question of this. For none can be of the Governing Clergy without taking an *Oath*, in which they own the Pope's Authority with a witness. For they swear *Faith* to him, and that in those Terms which import as well a Temporal as a Spiritual subjection. No doubt that was *Hildebrand's* sense that made the (b) Oath, and it is most agreeable to the Principles and Practices of them that Impose it. But this I leave to Temporal Princes and States, and especially to Protestants, who are chiefly concerned, to consider it. Let the Oath be for Spirituals only, it is enough to prove the Churches subjection to the Pope; because, in that sense at least, it is taken by all the Governing Clergy. And for the rest, there is a (c) *Form of Profession*, by which they are sworn to him every one in his Person, for fear they should not think themselves obliged by the Oaths of their Superiors.

2 Pag. 6.

a V. Labbi's
Edition of the
Councils. tom.
X. p. 23. A. and
p. 379. E.
compared
with the Oath
in the *Pentifi-
cal*.

c *Ib.* tom. XIV.
col. 944. C. &
v. sup. p. 10.

If

If among them that are the Guides of Conscience to others, there be any that makes no Conscience of an Oath ; yet such a one will go which way his Interest leads him. And the Pope has them all secured to him by Interest likewise. Not to speak of those ways that his Interests are theirs, nor of other ways that he has to oblige them ; it is enough that he is so far Patron of the whole Church, that none can have a Bishoprick, or any other eminent Dignity, but he must either take it of the Pope's gift, or at least he must come to him for Confirmation.

Having two such sure holds, on the Bodies, and on the Souls, of his Clergy ; the Pope is not only in present possession of a spiritual Monarchy over the whole Roman Church, but he is (as much as it is possible for him to be) assured that none shall ever be able to take it out of his hands. Unless the Princes of his Communion should come to find their Interest in a Reformation, which is rather to be wisht for than to be expected in our Age ; otherwise, there is nothing that can dispossess him, but a general Council. And that indeed he has some cause to apprehend upon the experience of former times. It is remembred by others too often for the Pope to forget it, how such a Council, (d) when time was, humbled two or three of his Predecessors. But then they that were for the Liberty of the Church, had not only the Diffusive Church on their side, but they had a good party among the Cardinals themselves. Especially they had the Papacy at an Advantage, being to Judge whose it was, among them that pretended

*4 v. Supra
p. 88.*

to it. They had also the times very favourable to them, in other Circumstances, which I shall not mention, because they are not like to come again. And yet then, what ground they got from Popes of disputable Titles, they lost afterward to those whose Titles were certain. They left free Declarations and Laws for future times, which might do good, if there were men to put Life in them. But withal they left a certain experiment, to shew us, that that good cannot be done by men who are so engaged to the Papacy.

Interest of it self were enough to give the Pope a Majority of Bishops in any Council where Conscience did not bear too much sway. It was observed by one (e) that writ for the Authority of those Councils; that they could never keep up their side, for this reason, because the Pope had the disposing of all the Livings. But how much greater must his Party be, when all the Bishops are bound in Conscience likewise, as far as an Oath can oblige them, to support the Popes spiritual Monarchy? It is hard for men to think that such an Oath does not bind them, as well when they are together, as severally. We see the Pope so well understood this, that when (f) it was proposed during the Council of *Trent*, that, to make it a Free Council, he should *dispense with the Oaths* of all the Bishops that sat there; his Legates declared that they would *rather die* than consent to it. I suppose they would not have been so much concerned for that which they had not found to be of very great use in their business. And we see the effect of it. For all the Bishops there present, though

* *John Major.*

† Anno 1552.
Hist. Conc. Trid.
l. 4. and Pallavic.
hist. XII.
15. 12. & 15.

though it was against many of their wills, yet suffered the Council to be prorogued, and translated, and rid about how and when the Pope pleased, till he had done with them, that is, till they had (g) made it unnecessary for him ever to have another Council. V. *supra* p. 10.

But as safe as he has made himself, in case there should be a General Council; it cannot be denied, that it is safer for him to have none. And therefore presuming there shall be none for the future, as we may judge by the experience of the last hundred years; we come now to consider what his power is in the Intervals of Councils.

During these, it is acknowledged by the whole Roman Church, and that as well by the Laity as the Clergy, that the Pope has the supreme Authority over all Christians. Which being another kind of Supremacy than we are used to, we are to learn what it is from them that live under it. What they say and write of it, is not the sense of the Church, as that is which they swear in those Forms before-mentioned. And yet their Oaths being in general terms, we cannot so thoroughly know it from them, as from particular Instances of the Exercise of it. I suppose they may be said to give him that Power, which he exercises every where without let or contradiction. And to name only such Instances, there are two which more particularly concern us, and which make him no less than some call him, that is, the Virtual Church.

First, he takes upon himself, and they allow him, to be the only supreme Judge of Fact in Ecclesiastical

Ecclesiastical matters. So that whomsoever he has judged to be Heretics, (of what rank soever they are, Kings not excepted,) they are subject to all Canonical Punishments, and are avoided as if they were such indeed as he judges them. And as he does not trouble himself to call a Council, and to take their sense of the matter before he judges; so neither, if he judge amiss, are the injured Parties relievable by Appeal to any other Judge whatsoever. If any question this, they do ill to call us Heretics; who were never condemned by any Council, at least, not by any that pretended to represent the Universal Church. It was indeed moved at the Council of *Trent*, that they should have declared against Queen *Elizabeth*, and it is said (b) that they forbore to do it for politic reasons. But when the Pope (i) saw his time to declare, it did as well: for, though by the same Bull he deprived her of her Kingdom, all her Subjects of that Church broke Communion with her, even they that disobeyed the Sentence of Deprivation. Since her time it does not appear that we are under any Sentence, but the Popes yearly Curse on Maundy Thursday; and yet that is enough to continue the breach of Communion. Nay, when *Henry VIII.* was condemned by the Pope only, and judged a Heretic for no other cause but disobedience to him; though he had a just and lawful Appeal then depending, yet then the Popes Sentence was obeyed, and he was treated as a Heretic by all those of the Roman Communion. If this be not owning the Pope to have an Absolute Authority, yet at least it is no small

* Pallavic. hist.
Trent. XXI. 7. 5
i Sand. de
Schism. Contiu.
p. 182.

small Priviledge, that they allow him, to let in and shut out of their Church whom he pleases.

But he claims a higher Priviledge than this; that is, to be judge also of Doctrines, to define what shall be Faith or Heresie. This he actually does. And the Church so far abets him in it, that if private persons seem to question his Judgment, (as some did when he condemned the *Jansenists* Propositions,) they are punished for it as Rebels to the Church. Now being in possession of this power to judge of Doctrines, what security can they have that he will not employ it to advance his own Secular Interests under the specious pretence of Christian Faith? If he please to make it of Faith that all men must obey him, even in Temporal things; this is done already in a (k) Decretal Epistle if there be any Coherence between the two ends of it. If he should think fit to call it the (l) *Henrician* Heresie, for any one to hold that Kings may be obeyed notwithstanding his Censures: If he call it the Heresie of the (m) *Politici* for any one to deny the exemption of the Clergy from Secular Courts; or the Heresie of (n) *Simon Magus*, to hold that Lay men may lawfully present to Church Livings: there is nothing new in all this, and therefore he may colourably do it. Nay, we have reason to believe he will do it, whensoever he thinks he may do it safely. And that will be, when he is no more in awe of the French Monarchy, than he was of the English when he censured the Irish Remonstrance. It may concern more than Protestants to consider this. For no man knows how soon the Pope may
be

^a *Unam san-
ctam, etc. de Ma-
jor. & Obed.
Concil. Edit.
Labd. tom. X.
p. 405. A. & c.*

^b *Baron. Anno.
1046. n. 4.*

^c *Baron. Anno
1111. n. 29. &
n. 42.*

be concerned either to have him condemned for a Heretic, or to make something that he holds go for Heresie. And either of these things being done, there is no doubt but that the Popes Act must be owned by the Roman Church, in consequence to to their now mentioned Principles. For all this is no other than the exercise of that power which they give him in spiritual things.

Whether they allow him to have the like power in Temporals, is the Question which we are next to consider. And that they do allow it him, will appear by all the means that we have to know the sense of that Church. First, their Church Virtual, that is, the Pope himself, has (o) declared it again and again; and that with all the Solemnities required by themselves to his decreeing *ex Cathedra*. There never was any Pope that disowned it, nor any that owned that Notion of the Virtual Church. Their Church Representative has declared it in divers Councils, of which one or other is owned to be General by all them of the Roman Communion. Whereas many require the the Popes Confirmation of Councils to make

* From *Hil-*
drand down-
ward.

¶ H. D. Considerations § XXX.
of third *Lateran*.

§ XXXI. of the fourth.

§ XXXVI. of the Council of
Lions.

¶ *Ibid.* § XXXVII. of the
Council of *Constance*, & v. *Con-*
cil. tom. 12. p. 276. D.

them General, there is no doubt but such (p) Councils, so confirmed, have declared it. For those that do not hold any necessity of the Popes Confirmation, those very (q) Councils, which they abet in not holding it necessary, have not only declared this, but they have taken it for a foundation, which in reason should be much more than a Definition. They supposed it as a thing

thing out of Controversie, and made sundry Acts in pursuance of it. Their Catholic Church Dissulative has own'd it, by receiving and approving of some Councils of both sorts; so as that whosoever has rejected the Councils of one sort, has received those of the other. They own it likewise in such Practices, as must be Catholic according to their Principles. If any practice be Catholic, what can be more properly so, than that which is the *first Commandment* of their Church? Namely, to keep her Festivals, to hear Mass, to joyn in Offices of the Church? This they do in the Memory, and with solemn Invocation of them as glorified Saints; who not only (while they lived) were abettors of this Doctrine, but who were Sainted for this reason, because they Abetted it. Such were (r) *Anselm*, and (s) *Becket*; of whom I need say no more than shew the Reader where he may find a very full Demonstration of this. But among the many more that I might add of this sort, I shall name only two that deserve more than ordinary notice. Namely, *Hildebrand*, the first Author of this Doctrine; and *Pius Quintus*; who was the first that practis'd it on Queen *Elizabeth* of blessed memory. This last mentioned Pope being newly canonized, I suppose, to let us know here in *England* what we are to expect when time serves. I do not see how they who suffer themselves to be imposed on in this manner, and who fulfil the design of the Imposers, in owning such men for Saints, can rationally avoid the owning of their Principles. And if the doing these things obliges any to own these Principles,

U it

r H.D. Confir-
derations,
§ XXVIII.
r 1b. § 1X. &c.

it has the same force throughout their whole Diffusive Church.

It is not so easie to answer the force of these Arguments as it is to produce Instances on the contrary; of them that have written against this Doctrine; especially in *France*, where it is said to be disowned by a National Church. But their Writings, and her Declarations, will stand us in no stead upon their Principles, who expressly except the Case of Heresie; as Cardinal *Perron* says they all did, and instances in the most eminent of them who defended the rights of Princes against Popes before the Reformation. For I think it will not be doubted that all the Writers of that Communion, (even those of the *Gallican* Church not excepted) look upon us as Heretics.

But besides the *French Church* has been so far from disowning this Doctrine, that they have Publicly declared for it, and that no longer since than in our Fathers days. It cannot yet be forgotten how the body of their Clergy, as representing the *Gallican* Church, by the mouth of their Speaker Cardinal *Perron* declared themselves in that famous Harangue, which was printed there with Royal privilege, and sent over hither to King *James*, that he might not be ignorant of their sense in this matter. And they declared it not only to be the present sense of their Church, but the same that it had constantly been, from the first opening of her Divinity Schools till *Calvins* time. They shew too much desire to have the *French Church* on their side, that confront these great Testimonies, with Acts of State, or Declarations of Universities, or with Writings of Private

* King *James* thought himself concerned to write his *Defence of the right of Kings*, in answer to it. v. his Works P 383.

Private men : When they cannot but know, that, according to their Principles, neither Private men, nor Parliaments, nor Universities, can pretend to be the *Gallican* Church in any case, where they differ from the Ecclesiastics.

But whereas Cardinal *Perron* there says, that all they who writ for the Rights of Princes against the Pope in those times before the Reformation, did nevertheless hold that the Pope might depose any Prince that should be guilty of Heresie : Though I do not engage to make good his Assertion in the utmost extent of it, because it is hard to know the mind of every Writer in that Controversie ; yet I think it is not hard to shew as many Kings who have declared their Judgment on his side, as there can be produced of those Writers to the contrary. And it is no small proof of the Authority of any Doctrine, when it is acknowledged by them, who would have been most obliged by their Interest to have denied it, if their Consciences would have given them leave. For examples of this, we cannot go higher than to the Emperour *Henry IV.* whose very troublesome times gave occasion to *Hildebrand* to bring this Doctrine first into the world. And it is very observable, that in the Infancy of it, he that was so unfortunate to be made the first Instance of the cursed effects of this Doctrine ; though he denied the Popes power over him in all other respects, yet he (1) owned it in this of Heresie, which is worth all the rest put together. Perhaps he thought it did not concern him, at

¹ *Brunonis Hist. belli Sax.* p. 122.
Lin. 18. in *Freheri Germ. edit.*
Francos. 1600.
Councils of *Labbé's* Edition,
Tom. XI. part. 1. Col. 727. D.
& 629. E.

first, so much as he found it did afterwards. For having granted that the Pope might depose him in case of Heresie, it was enough; Then the Pope knew what he had to do. It was only to make a new Heresie of something which he would not or could not deny; and then how easie was it to take away his Crown as being forfeited by his own Confession? Another example of this we have in the Emperour *Frederic II.* Who being in no very good terms with the Pope, thought to get into favour by shewing his zeal against Heresie. And he shewed it sufficiently, by giving the force of a Temporal (*n*) Law to that Canon of their General Council of *Lateran*; by which every *Heretic* is made to *forfeit* his Estate, as well they *that have no chief Lord over them*, as others of Inferiour rank and condition. In Consequence of this, when the Pope saw occasion to take away his Crown, and wanted only some good colour for it; among other crimes with which he charged him, this was one, that he was guilty of *Heresie*: which appeared, as the Pope was pleased to say, *by no doubtful and light, but by evident Arguments; for that it was manifest enough that he had run into many Perjuries*: These are the very words of the (*x*) Sentence. By which also it sufficiently appears, that not only Error in Doctrine, but even Vice or Misgovernment may suffice to make a Heretic, when a Prince's being so will forfeit his Crown to the Pope. But as Humane Nature is, and in a Fortune so liable to temptation, how hard a thing it is for any Prince to escape this charge? while the Pope is allowed to be Judge, as well who is guilty of the Fact, as what

* *Brut. An.*
1221. n. 2. &
1225. n. 10.

* *Councils of*
Labbe's Edition,
Tom. XI.
part. 1. Col.
642. A.

what Fact shall amount to a Heresie. For he may as groundlesly judge one guilty of Perjury, as he did in that Instance judge that guilt to be Heresie : And yet both these Judgments so inseparably belong to the same Jurisdiction, that they who grant him either of them, ought in reason to grant him both ; as we have shewn they do, according to the Principles of the Roman Church.

And whereas it is alleaged, that some National Councils have declared for the Independent right of Kings ; though none ever did so, but they are (s) branded for it, at least, in all the later Editions of the Councils ; yet of these it is observable, that they never supposed the Case of Heresie, in which there is no Reason to doubt that they went with the stream of the Roman Church. It is more observable that, bating that Case, the rights of Princes against the Pope were scarce ever maintained by any Council of any Nation or Province but those who were under the Aw of Princes. And even of them, very many have recanted, as soon as they found themselves at liberty to do it ; and that Conscientiously, as we have reason to believe. But on the other side, the most Conscientious Persons of that Communion have stood their ground in the most disadvantageous Circumstances. They have stuck to it, and maintained it, and never recanted their Doctrine ; howsoever they might have some remorse at some of those horrid Practices into which they were led by it.

Now by the Principles of that Communion, whatsoever has been the sense of their Church,
can

Being called
Conciliabula.

can never cease to be so on further trial, but must be the Churches Doctrine for ever. They who defend Infallibility of Judgment cannot avoid this. Nor they who hold Infallibility of Tradition : Since they teach, that, whatsoever has once prevailed, and that Universally over all Churches, and specially over all Conscientious Persons ; could never prevail so, unless it had been delivered from the beginning. But of this Doctrine it has been proved, that it was in the Church before those Councils above mentioned, and was either declared or supposed by those General Councils, therefore it must have been from Catholic Tradition. And therefore, according to their Principles, it ought not to be called to a review ; much less be disbelieved, or disputed, by any in this present Age, whatsoever advantage it may have, above those former Ages, in point of Learning and Monuments, for the discerning of Catholic Tradition.

Answer.

What has been said is sufficient to make it appear, that all they of the Roman Church, by the Principles of their Communion, are obliged to maintain these Doctrines of Popery. Whence it will follow, that as long as they are true to those Principles, we cannot be secure that they will not practise those Doctrines. Therefore all the reason we can have to believe that they will do us no hurt, if they are truly conscientious persons, is only this ; that we may hope they do not yet know their Churches sense in this matter. At present they do not see the repugnancy between
their

their Duty to Princes, and the Principles of their Communion. But this will only secure us so long as they do not see it; and that may be a very little while. For as the proofs of this Inconsistency are great, and notorious; so they are ready to be objected to them by their Adversaries in their own Communion. And therefore we can have little security of them, if we can have none any longer than while we may suppose them likely to continue in this Ignorance. So that the only solid and lasting reason that we have, or can have to hope well of the Loyalty of any such Conscientious Persons among them, must be the assurance that we have of their firmer adherence to their Duty to King and Country than to the Principles of their Communion.

Of these Persons we may be secured, whilst they are ignorant of that Inconsistence, because, if they are truly such as we take them to be, they cannot but think themselves bound in Conscience to deal fairly and uprightly with us. And when the Papalins, who will still be practising upon them, shall have brought them to discern that Inconsistency; the effect of it may be better than they intend. For we have reason to hope that such Persons will be so far from quitting their Duty for their Communion, that they may be rather induced to leave their Communion; when they shall be convinced that it is not possible to maintain it without complying with those Doctrines which they have in so great detestation. And these hopes of the good effect of this Countenance to them
above

above others, and of the consequent jealousie of those others of their own Communion, may be a farther encouragement to zealous Protestants, to shew them this countenance; Not only in regard of the security which such as these may give to the State, but also in regard of the hopes, that, in process of these disputes among themselves, they may at last by the wisdom of God be won over to the Protestant Communion.

And concerning these Persons for whom the favour of the Laws is desired, we have reason to believe that many of them do really adhere more firmly to the sense of their duty to their Country, than to that of continuing in the Roman Communion. Many of them are such as have given good proof of it already, of which Instances might be produced, if it were necessary. But to wave all Historical inquiries in this place; If the State desire satisfaction herein, it may be had by the form which shall be tendred to them. By which they may profess that they do in Conscience believe themselves more obliged to pay their duty to their Prince and Country, than to stand to the Authoritative Decision of any Judge whatsoever that is owned in the Church of that Communion.

*The second
Objection.*

The second thing objected against that discrimination here proposed, is this, which were considerable enough of it self, but much more being added to the other. It is said, that we can have no assurance of any engagement they make to us, they have so many ways to elude the force of it; what by Equivocation, and Mental Reservation, what

what by Popes Dispensations, by their Doctrine of Probability, and the rest. There are so many of them, that, considered one after another, they look like a contrivance to destroy all Faith among men. For when we think our selves assured by their Promise, and especially, when confirmed with an Oath; yet, by Equivocation, that Oath, in their sense, shall signifie quite otherwise than was meant by them that made or imposed it. If they do not Equivocate, yet they may have some mental Reservation; saying inwardly *not*, or something else that quite alters the meaning of what is spoken. And if they Swear without either of these tricks; yet they may believe the Pope can dispense with that Oath, or he can absolve them when they have taken it. And though the Pope should not do this, yet their Church * hath given them the President of breaking Faith with known Heretics. And if they make Conscience of that; yet it may be some Doctors opinion, that there is something unlawful in this Oath, which though they did not discover before, and therefore took it, yet having discovered this after, they may think themselves not obliged by it. And though they should not be of this Doctors opinion, yet that extrinsic probability of this Doctors Authority may be enough to sway them against their own convictions to the contrary. The Probability that there is of their holding all these opinions, as having been held by Doctors of Reputation among them, and none of them ever censured for it by the Church, (though she hath taken all possible care to censure all such opinions as may

* Council of
Constance Sess.
19. in Labbe's
Edition of
Councils, Tom.
XII. Col. 196.
E. & 1. O. A.

be any way contrary either to her Judgment or Interest) this presumption is sufficient to persuade private persons, that their Church, though perhaps she may not believe them true, yet believeth them not hurtful or dangerous to her Children. And if a Doctrine hath no danger in it, though it prove to be false, yet the security of it is inducement enough for men to practise it. These Principles will the rather hold, because according to their other Principles, they are taught to rely on the Judgment of their Church in matters of belief even where they cannot do it without renouncing their own Judgment.

And in this Objection, it is very considerable, that it is not so easie as it was in the former, to distinguish who they are that do indeed hold these dangerous Principles. Only we have reason to suspect all them that keep to that Communion upon Principles of Conscience. For they must think themselves bound in Conscience to hold these Principles to be practicable, because they are so, according to the Principles of their Communion. And they who are once suspected upon prudent grounds, can neither clear themselves, nor satisfy us, by any form of profession they can make. Because we must still suspect, that such persons do prevaricate, even in those forms by which they seem to renounce Prevarication. This Objection hath been made, and it is not without visible cause.

Answer.

Now in answer to this, it cannot be denied but that many of them have maintained such Principles of this kind as would destroy all possible
trust

trust in dealing with them. And if they had stood to these Principles in their Actions, this would have given us cause to suspect all the rest of their Communion, while they continue in it.

But whatsoever they say in their disputes, we have reason to judge of their belief, by what they shew of it when they come to the trial of Action. And thus, even the Papalins themselves have not ventured to act upon these Principles, even where they could have nothing to hinder them from it, but convictions of Conscience. They who have died rather than they would take that Oath, which according to these Principles they might have taken, and prevaricated in it, have plainly shewn, that even they durst not trust their own subtilties when they came to be practised. Nay, the Pope himself, who hath forbidden them to take these Oaths, and hath animated them to be Martyrs rather than take them, would not have exposed his dearest friends to such extreme hazards, if in earnest he himself could have approved the practising of these Principles.

The utmost therefore that we may fear in dealing with them seems only this; that, whilst they renounce one form of Prevarication, they may make use of another. If they renounce Equivocation; they may at the same time, believe themselves obliged not to Equivocate, and yet not renounce the belief of the Popes Authority to dispense with their Oath, if that be not expressly contained in the Form.

But we have no Reason to believe, that men of such Politics as the Court of *Rome* are known to

be, can possibly, when they come to practise, own such Principles, as are like to prove so prejudicial to their own Interest. Or if they should be overseen so far as to do this, yet the mischief that would follow upon it being likely to prove more dangerous to themselves than to us, we have no reason to fear running the hazard of it. For if there are any that believe that they may prevaricate in the very same form of prevarication which they renounce; How is it possible that the Roman Court it self can be assured of such persons? That Court it self hath found by experience, that it hath had many real enemies, that still pretended to live in its Communion. How can they be assured but that many of these, who pretend to be their Servants and Subjects, may prove to be their dangerous Enemies? If in earnest they may prevaricate, even *coram Judice*, in a thing not belonging to his Jurisdiction; how can the Court secure themselves, that persons persuaded of the injustice of the Popes Claim to a power in temporal things upon any pretence whatsoever; may not prevaricate with him, since they believe that these matters belong not to his Jurisdiction? How can they secure themselves, but that multitudes of such persons, may, therefore, still keep to their Communion; purposely to form Intrigues against them, which they could not do, if they were out of it? It is certain that not only the Papalins have owned these Doctrines, but even those who have been the greatest Adversaries of the Papacy among themselves. Particularly, the Council of *Constance* is that which gave Authority to the
Doctrines

Doctrine of breaking Faith with known Heretics. And according to the definition of that same Council, the (a) Pope himself, and all they who challenge for him the Supremacy over Councils, are Heretics for doing so. And therefore, why may they not break Faith with him as well as with any other Heretic? This is a just reason for him to suspect, and they who are once suspected can give him no assurance by these Principles.

* Council of
Basil in Laide's
Councils, Tom.
XII. p. 620. D.
⊕ 621. A. ⊕
766. B. ⊕
767. B.

Since therefore the belief of this liberty of using Reflexive Prevarication, is neither for the Interest, nor agreeable to the practice of the Roman Court it self; and since the danger that may follow in the trust of it must be more theirs than ours, for it destroys the Faith of all whom they have to employ either to defend themselves or to prejudice us; we have reason to believe that Forms, whereby they renounce prevarication, may oblige them to bar themselves the use of those Prevarications which they do therein expressly renounce. So that for giving us compleat security, nothing more can be desired but that the Forms to be tendred to them may take in all the cases wherein any celebrated Doctors among them do allow them this liberty of prevaricating. And therefore the drawing up of this Test would be more properly a work of Divines than of Statesmen; and more particularly, of such Divines as have been most conversant in the Casuists of the Roman Church.

If this will not suffice, how is it possible that even Protestants, who are once suspected of inclining

inclining to Popery; can ever purge themselves of this Imputation? We have had too many Instances of unjust Accusations of this kind. It hath been generally the Fate of them who have been most zealous for the Church of *England*, or for any thing of Order and Discipline in it, to have been thus represented to the people by men who have desired to make them odious. And the mischief which must follow upon this distrust among our selves, even of those who are our most zealous Patriots, and therefore most eminently capable of doing service, is a mischief much greater than we can fear from any thing that can follow on such a trust of the Romanists as have been here described. It will make us incapable of driving on any great design, either for our own defence, or to defeat their machinations against us. And therefore it must be much more mischievous to us, than any hurt we can suffer from those of the Roman Communion, especially from those who desire, not our *trust*, but *protection*.

If it be farther suspected, that, when they have taken all the Tests that can be given them, still their minds may alter after all this; and that so long as their Priests are near them, and have their ear, we have too just reason to suspect that they may actually change. It will be easie to reply, that a change may be possible, when all diligence hath been used to the contrary. But we have no reason to believe it probable, of them who, by a Test that hath been before propounded, shall profess themselves more obliged to their Duty to King and Country than to any Judgment or Interest of their

their Church to the contrary. For whosoever they are that are ready to oppose the Judgment of their Church it self, if she should declare any thing contrary to their duty; it cannot in reason be supposed, that they should be so far influenced by a Priest, as to do that for his sake, which they would not do in obedience to the Church. But if yet it be farther suspected, that their Priests may be enabled to work such a change in their Penitents by their Intimacy and Assiduity with them, and by that Reverence that is usually born to their Persons, which, being alway present with them, may perhaps prevail more than the dumb Definitions of the Church. Yet this danger the State may very easily remedy, and will do it by the making of a just and prudent discrimination. For that being to be made by such a Test as the State shall require, no other Priests will be allowed, but only such as have taken it. And the Test being made with such a Clause as hath been proposed, the Priests that take it will be upon the same terms with their Laity; and will be equally obliged in behalf of the State, to oppose any pretence that can be brought by any person or power whatsoever to draw them from their Allegiance.

And if there be any fear of Practices against the State by them that, having taken the Test, have been secretly changed by some means against which no provision is made; the danger of this also may be prevented, as far as any thing may be done by Obligations of Conscience. Not to say that their Interest will oblige them likewise in great measure.

It may be done by a frequent Repetition of this Test, which may discover any change in some short time after it is made; and so may give an early stop to any practices which might follow upon it. The Priests also may be obliged by their Oath to declare the Independent Right of Kings in their Sermons, as expressly, and as oft, as the State shall prescribe. And it may be so ordained that they shall continue in their charge no longer than while they can bring sufficient Testimony that they have done it. These expedients will suffice in all likelihood to prevent the defection of them who have given security to the State, or at least will secure it in time from receiving any dangerous hurt by their defection.

CONCLUSION.

TO conclude all with a brief Summary of what I conceive advisable in this whole affair. I think it is not so proper to make the distinction between Regulars and Seculars. Because many Seculars are more addicted to these Principles than many of the Regulars; and some of the Regulars have declared against these Principles, and suffered for it more than any Seculars in our age. Besides that it may seem very partial to prejudice men by their Ranks, when they may distinguish themselves sufficiently otherwise. Yet withal, whereas there are divers of those Regular Orders, that were never received in *England*, even by the Romanists themselves; and who have here intruded themselves as well against their own

own (c) Canons as against the known Laws of the Land; it is but reasonable that we should take that Advantage against them, which not only our Laws, but even their own Canons will allow. Especially where we have Reason in other regards to suspect them above others of being active and industrious in driving on dangerous designs. And this Advantage may be taken against (d) three eminent Orders among them; which have been founded since the Reformation, and were never Canonically received here in *England*, and yet are as Active as any other in designs for the advancing of Popery.

For the rest who are not thought fit to be totally excluded, the most equal way for them, and as secure a way for us, to distinguish them; is to do it by such a Test as has been more than once before mentioned. That this is a safe way may appear from what hath been already shewn; that even the high Papalins themselves cannot prevaricate in renouncing Prevarication, and therefore may be capable of giving assurance to the State by submission to Tests, if they are known to be conscientious otherwise. But antecedently to any Test, for some of them, it would be requisite, that they should first renounce their former Oaths and Obligations; or explain them so as to secure us that they will not be induced by them to any dangerous practice against the State. Those of them, as their Bishops and others, who have taken Oaths to the Pope, as they are prescribed by their Pontifical; either to explain them, if they can possibly do it, so that we may be satisfied of their Innocency; or to retract them, where they will not admit of such an Explication. And here also it ought to be considered what Oaths are taken by those Profelytes whom they gain into the Roman Communion.

When this is done, and not till then, they may be capable of being admitted to take the Test. Which

Y

ought

c No new or
d. r of Regu-
lars is to be
admitted in
any place
without leave
of the Ordina-
ry, v. Conc.
Trident. Sess.
24. de Regular.
Cap. 3. & Bul-
lam 1216. VIII.
1628. Aug. 28.
which begins
with Romanus
Pontifex in the
Bullarium Chro-
nologia of Lyons
Edition.
Tom. IV. p. 62.
4 Jesuites,
discalceat Car-
melites, and
Cappucins.

ought in reason to contain all that which the Law hath already prescribed, as being that which the wisdom of our Law-makers have judged fit and suitable to their condition. It is not reasonable for them to expect that any of those trials should be waved which have been made even since the Reformation; as long as the same Reason continues which prevailed with our Legislators to prescribe them. But if they were to make a Test for themselves, I do not see how they can with any confidence decline those professions which were made by their Ancestors before the Reformation. They have so frequently boasted of them, and alledge them as Arguments of the Consistence of their Religion with their Loyalty. And therefore it were fit that the Test should take in all those Doctrines concerning the Rights of Kings which are contained or supposed in the Ancient Laws. Especially in those which themselves have produced for the honour of their Communion; as namely, the *Affize of Clarendon*, the Statutes of *Provisors* and *Premunire*. These they cannot with any confidence refuse, if they will but pretend to deal ingenuously, and to let us see that they have been in earnest in those Elogies which they have given their Predecessors for making them. Beside the forementioned particulars, it were also needful for our satisfaction, that they would profess themselves so far convinced in Conscience of their Obligation to their Prince and Country, that no Ecclesiastical Judge or Judiciary whatsoever shall be able to draw them either from the belief, or from the practice of their Duty. This will fully secure us of their Loyalty, if they deal sincerely in it. And for satisfying us of their sincerity, it hath already been advised, to renounce all their pretences to Dissimulation. And great care should be taken that no Doctrine be left out of this Test, which would leave them any liberty of this kind, in the Judgment of any celebrated or uncensured Casuist in their Church. This

This will be not only a sufficient, but also a just ground to distinguish between them. For when a Test being thus contrived shall be prescribed by Authority, it will then appear that none are like to suffer the severity of the Laws but they who either are truly Criminal, or are justly suspected of being so, even for their refusing of such a Test. And then that due severity which may be thought necessary to preserve the State from their practising against it, may be executed on them with less colour of exception to the Penalties. They who have extolled the Loyalty of their forefathers, in making those Laws already mentioned, cannot except against the Penalties mentioned in those Laws. They cannot pretend that there was any other Cause of severity, in them, but their care for the security of the Public; for they were otherwise of their own Communion, and therefore could not be liable to any suspicion of that rigour against them, of which they may suspect us in regard of our differences of Communion. For other penalties, I say no more, but leave them to the wisdom of the State; who best know that due measure of severity that is requisite in our present Circumstances. For as their case may in some Reasons vary from the condition of them against whom those Laws were made; so it is fit that their punishments should do so too, whether their case be more excusable now or then, that also I do not take upon me to determine. For them who will take the Test so contrived, and that as oft as the State shall require; it were fit that such favour be shewn to them as may consist with the safety of the State. And all the favour which themselves have desired, is their exemption from Sanguinary Laws, and protection against their Popish Adversaries, and permission to live in their Country, upon the same terms as other dissenters do, who are as Innocent as themselves will be upon this supposal.

As for Places of trust, they do not pretend to them. Which may be a security against all reasonable jealousies. For other Laws which have been made against the foreign Education of their Children; they will not then have the pretence of any necessity for it, when they may have them taught at home, by persons well affected to the State, and yet otherwise of their own Religion. And they will have no excuse, if they do it without any necessity. So that they cannot object against any Determination that the State shall think fit to make in that particular; whether the Laws now in force shall be continued, or changed, and if continued, under whatsoever Conditions and Penalties it should be done.

And if it be thought fit to impose on them such small pecuniary Penalties as may only oblige them in Interest to endeavour the farther satisfaction of their Conscience; it might be convenient that those sums were applied to maintain converts to the Church, and to reward them that shall inform the State how these things are observed among them.

This will be likely to keep up the practice of these Laws, when they cannot be secured from discoverers among themselves. And may also be a means by degrees to reduce them to the Communion of the Church in order to the capacitating of them for farther favours.

Thus much was in Prudence necessary to be said, to shew as well the Practicableness, as the Convenience of this Proposal. The Convenience has appeared in the Discourse it self, and the Practicableness in the Answer to the Objections. For other more particular Expedients I leave them to the Prudence of the State; whose most proper Office it is, and who are best acquainted with all particular Circumstances to determine.

1860

1860
1861
1862
1863
1864
1865
1866
1867
1868
1869
1870
1871
1872
1873
1874
1875
1876
1877
1878
1879
1880
1881
1882
1883
1884
1885
1886
1887
1888
1889
1890
1891
1892
1893
1894
1895
1896
1897
1898
1899
1900

1860
1861
1862
1863
1864
1865
1866
1867
1868
1869
1870
1871
1872
1873
1874
1875
1876
1877
1878
1879
1880
1881
1882
1883
1884
1885
1886
1887
1888
1889
1890
1891
1892
1893
1894
1895
1896
1897
1898
1899
1900

.....

Imprimatur.

Novemb. 9.
1678.

Guil. Jane, R. P. D.
Hen. Episc. Lond. à
sacris domesticis.

A 7.10.32

SERMON

AT THE
FUNERAL



OF

Sir EDMUND-BURY GODFREY,

One of His Majesties Justices of the Peace,

Who was Barbarously Murdered.

Preached on *Thursday* the last day of *Octob.* 1678.

In the Parish-Church of *St. Martin in the Fields.*

BY

WILLIAM LLOYD D.D. Dean of Bangor,

One of His Majesties Chaplains in Ordinary,

Vicar of the said Parish of *St. Martin.*

L O N D O N:

Printed by *M. Clark*, for *Henry Brome*, at the
Gun, at the West-End of *St. Pauls.* 1678.

SEP 18 1878

THE

NEW YORK

NEW YORK

NEW YORK

NEW YORK

1878

NEW YORK

NEW YORK

NEW YORK

NEW YORK

NEW YORK

NEW YORK

A
Funeral Sermon.
 O N

2 S A M. iii. 33, 34.

33. *And the King lamented over Abner, and said, Died Abner as a fool dieth?*

34. *Thy hands were not bound, nor thy feet put into fetters: as a man falleth before wicked men, so fellest thou. And all the people wept again over him.*



IF I could at any time allow my self to transgress the rules of this place, to Preach without a Text, it should be now, having this subject before me. Here's a subject that makes it's own Sermon and it's own Prayer. *The Blood of Abel speaks*, saith the A-
 postle. *This Innocent Blood speaks and cries* Heb. xi. 4.

B

in

Rev. vi. 10.

in the Ears of God, (the All-knowing God that hears matter without words;) it speaks and cries aloud to him for Vengeance: *How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judg and avenge?*

It speaks to you, to your eyes, and to your hearts, many sad and astonishing things. I judg of others by my self; I do not hear, but I feel what this speaks to me? It speaks in such Language as this,

Oh my Friends! I spent my life in serving you. It was my business to do Justice and shew Mercy. See what I had for it, Insnared and Butcher'd by wicked Men against Justice and without Mercy. How many things did I endure e're they brought me to this? How many Lies were you told the mean while, to hide it from you? How many deaths have I suffered before Death came to relieve me? And if that would have satisfied them, if they would but have Buried me, you should have heard none of all this. But their Malice went farther; My poor mangled macerated Body must be thrown out to Birds and Beasts, and my Name to the obloquy of worse men. Then it was time for me to speak for my self, and God brought a number of you to hear me: then

then I said, see, see, O my Friends, how they have used me ! Behold the Spectacle they have given you.

I saw it among the rest : It was a most dismal sight, such as that which we read of Judg. xix. 30. *It was so, that all that saw it, said, There was no such deed done nor seen from the time that we first came to be a Nation, till this day.*

'Tis possible I might find something like it among other Nations ; but I shall confine my self to what we find among the people of God. And of all that God delivers to us in Scripture, among them, I think there is no example like that of the Murther of *Abner*, which occasioned those words which I have chosen for my Text. And because I do not intend to dwell upon that, I shall shew you (but briefly) these three particulars in it,

First, the Person ; secondly, his Sufferings ; and thirdly, the Consequences of it.

First, the Person ; that was *Abner*, an eminent man, both in dignity, and also in usefulness among his people.

Secondly, His Sufferings ; a bloody violent death. And herein I have three things to consider.

First, the kind of Fact : He died, he fell by
B 2 wicked

wicked men : He was Murthered by *Joab* and *Abishai*.

Secondly, the manner of it ; Perfidiously and cruelly, with shew of the greatest Friendship they inhumanly killed him.

Thirdly, the Authors of it ; Such as can pretend Friendship to destroy ; such no doubt are wicked men, the most dangerous sort of wicked men. By such a Wise man may be caught, and die like a Fool ; a mighty man may be deprived of the use of his hands ; a wary man may be deprived of the use of his feet : There is no fighting with such ; nor no running away from such an Enemy.

This *David* exprest in his Lamentation, which moved the People to theirs, and that was the Consequence of it, which comes last to be considered.

I shall repeat you my Text, that you may see how all these parts lie together.

The King Lamented over Abner, and said, Died Abner as a Fool dieth? Could he make no shift for himself? Why couldst thou not fight? Thy hands were not bound, nor thy feet put in Fetters, why could thou not run away? The reason is plain, thou couldst do nothing to help thy self. Thou wert caught in a trap. As a man falleth before

fore wicked men, so fellest thou. This the King having said, *all the People*, who wept before, *now wept again over Abner.*

For the Person here sponen of; He was a (a) ^{(a) 1 Sam. xiv.} Prince of the Blood, (b) ^{(b) Josepho a-} Cousin German to King Saul, and General of his Armies all his ^{(c) Jos. Ant. Jud. lib. 7. c. 1.} Reign. He was an excellent person (as (c) ^{(c) Jos. Ant. Jud. lib. 7. c. 1.} Josephus describes him) for Counsel, and Courage, and Diligence, and Experience in affairs. There is ground to believe this from Scripture, which makes him after Saul's Death, to have been the only support of his Son and Successor Ishbosheth. 'Tis said 2 Sam. ii. 8. 9. That *Abner took Ishbosheth, and made him King over all Israel.* He might, in all probability, considering the others weakness, easily have made himself King if he pleased. But he was true to his Relation and his Trust. In this Chapter, at the sixth verse, *He set himself with all his might for the House of Saul.*

Amidst his cares and concerns for the State, he was not forgetful of the Church, as appears by his Dedications, 1 Chron. xxvi. 28.

I find nothing that can any way blemish his Memory, unless it was something contained in this Chapter; where it is said, that he was charged by *Ishbosheth*, with dishonouring the
Bed

Joseph. Th.

Bed of his late Master. ver. 7. He asked him, *Wherefore hast thou gone in unto my Fathers Concubines?* Josephus believeth the information was not true; and it seems not so likely of one of his age, being then above sixty years old when the King charged him with it.

2 Sam. iiii. 5,
10.

The more cause he had to lay this to heart. It made that great man think his Service misplaced; and that God was not pleased with what he did for *Sauls* Family, in opposition to *David*, who had a better title to the Crown. He knew that the Government was not yet made Hereditary, but that it was conferred immediately by God, who had decreed that he would take away *Saul* and set up *David* in his stead. And reflecting upon this, *Abner* swore he would now make amends for his Error, he would bring over the Kingdom to *David*.

2 Sam. iiii. 11.

This *Ishbosheth* heard; and durst not gain-say. Nay, it seems he consented to it, by what followeth. For when *Abner* sent to *David* for Terms, and he required this preliminary point, that his Wife *Michal* should be sent home to him; we read that *Ishbosheth* used his Authority in the matter. He sent for his Sister *Michal*, and delivered her to *Abner*, to take her with him

Verse 13, 14,
15.

him when he went to perfect his agreement with *David*.

This being supposed, that he had *Ishbosheth's* consent, I do not see what can be blamed in the conduct of *Abner*. I see much to be commended in him; especially considering the greatness of his Birth, and how near he was to the Crown, and in what probability he stood for it; that notwithstanding all these temptations, he still adhered to just and right, he kept his Loyalty to his Prince, he did all possible Service to his Country.

He was about the greatest work, to secure both the peace and the Religion of Gods people, in uniting them under the government of *David*; when unexpectedly he was taken off by Death, which is the *second* thing I am to consider.

His Death was Untimely, and Bloody, and Treacherous.

First, Untimely; for he was then in the midst of his Business. He had been at *Hebron* 2 Sam. iii. 20, with *David*. He had made his terms with him; such as would have united all *Israel* ^{11.} without a stroke; such as would have saved *Ishbosheth's* life, as appears by what follows, 2 Sam. iv. 1. (which confirms me in what I said

said, that he had his consent along with him ; For there it is said) *When Saul's Son heard that Abner was dead, his hands were feeble, and all the Israelites were troubled.* Then, and not before, the reins of Government fell out of his hands. He could hold them no longer, when his friend *Abner* was dead. Both his and all *Israel's* hopes, depended upon *Abner's* safe return.

And he was so far towards it. He was then upon the way, when he was fetched back to *Hebron* by a Messenger in *David's* name. So *Josephus* understands those words in the 26. verse, *But David knew not of it ;* It was in *David's* name, but he knew it not.

Joseph. Ib.

2 Sam. 3. 27.

And when *Abner* was come back, even at the Gate of the Royal City, he was met and received by some friends whom he did not suspect. They had him apart from his company, they brought him into a lone place, *Josephus* saith *Josephus*, to tell him something which the King had forgot. And there he soon had his Message ; it was a Stab, that put an end to his life.

Joseph. Ib.

The Authors of this fact were as soon known as the fact it self. They were *Joab* and *Abishai*, the Sons of *Zerviah* ; men that had a pretence

pretence to do this, in revenge of their Brother whom *Abner* had slain some years since in defence of his own life. Revenge was an ill reason; but the Scripture mentions that, as the only one they had to give. The true reason was (saith the Jewish Historian, who is herein followed by most Christians,) because they feared that among *Abner's* Terms, this was one, to keep his place, to be General of the Armies of *Israel*. That interfered with the Ambition of these men, who were resolved to have all the power to themselves, to admit of no sharer. They would scarce take in the King himself; Even He complained, they were too hard for him, in the last verse of this Chapter. *I am weak this day, though anointed King, and these men the Sons of Zerviah are too hard for me.* It appeared they were so, by this, that he durst not call them to account for it.

But he did all that he could. He disclaimed, he detested the wicked fact; He curst the Authors of it most bitterly. He exposed them to the people; requiring them all to mourn for *Abner*, and to shew all possible signs of it, by renting their cloaths; and putting on Sackcloth; which the people did most willingly

lingly, and *Joab* durst not but do it among the rest. In this mournful array they attended him to his grave. The King followed him weeping, and all the people wept with him, saith the Text.

When they had buried him, the King pronounced the *ἑνὸς ἑσθίου*, the funeral Song, for so the word *נאֵפֶה* signifies, which being in *Joab's* and *Abishai's* presence, it was a fresh mortification to them, as well as a just honour to *Abner*. The King lamented over *ABNER*, saying, &c.

I intended all this but to shew you in Scripture a Record which God hath given us of his peoples behaviour in such a case as we have before us. Such as that in divers respects, though very different in many other. And yet whereinsöever they differ, if their case exceed our's in some respects, it is exceeded by our's in so many more, as may sufficiently justifie us, and oblige us to the like Lamentation.

Only bating this one Circumstance, *Abner's* high birth and quality, being a Prince of the blood, and so nearly allied to King *David*, (which, together with some other publick considerations, might well oblige *Da-*
vid

vid himself to be present at his Funeral. This we have no reason to expect of our King, who hath done in other respects more than *David* could or durst do for *Abner*. But (waiving this,) we have all other Considerations, some greater than what God's people had in my Text, to weep and weep again, in our private and in our public Lamentations.

First, the Person, and his Personal Accomplishments, were such, as, though I would not compare them with *Abners*; yet I would not lessen him by declining the Comparison. They were very considerable in his rank. He was a great blessing to this place, and will be so understood, as all God's Blessings are, by the loss of them.

But secondly, for the Kind of our loss, for the things that he indured, for the manner in which he was brought to it, for the Treachery and Barbarity of it; These things are so far above all that were in *Abner's* case, that we cannot admit them into the comparison.

Thirdly, For the Authors of *Abner's* Murder, they were known, by this, and one more, that of *Amasai* whom they killed in

like manner. But for our's they are unknown. We are yet to enquire for them, and we have reason to fear we may find them too late, and yet too soon.

Lastly, for the Consequences, I shall shew you how the King hath lamented it ; and how, besides all that we have done, we are yet to do it so as to make the best of our loss ; To sow in Tears that we may reap in Joy. That is the End and Benefit of our Lamentation.

First of the Person, I must crave leave to say so much as may justify the public sorrow upon the account of an Extraordinary loss. And, being my self particularly concerned in it, I may be allowed to speak with the more freedom. 'Tis all the way I have to shew my Gratitude for the many good offices that I among many others received from him, while he was living. And what I am to say, I have so well considered, that I do not fear to be suspected of Flattery by any that knew him so well as most of you did in this place.

As to those things which belong to a private Christian, I ought to know him better than most others; and I did know *that* by him which gives me abundant comfort in his Death. I knew him to be a Just and Charitable man, a Devout, a Zealous

Zealous and Conscientious Christian. His Religion was more for use than for shew. And yet he was constant in all the acts of Gods Worship. He loved the Communion of the Church, as well out of Judgment as Affection. And though the compassion that he had for all men that did amiss, extended it self to all manner of Dissenters; and among them he had a kindness for the Persons of many *Roman-Catholicks*: Yet he always declared a particular Hatred and Detestation of *Popery*. I say this on purpose to be remembred, (because some would have him a *Papist*, or inclined that way,) I never pleased him with any duty I performed, at least he never thanked me for any, so much, as he did for those Sermons which I preacht here against *Popery*.

But these things are less considerable in our loss, we are more concerned for what he was in his Public capacity. And for that he seem'd made and fitted up with more than ordinary care: God seemed to have singled him forth, and designed him to be the useful man that he was in this place.

He was composed for it, both by Nature, and Education, and Choice, and Study, and Practice: I know not what could be added to make him fitter than he was. He

He was (as it were) Born to be a Justice of Peace ; his Grand-father, his Father, his elder Brother were so before him. The two last were also Members of Parliament. His great Grand-father was a Captain, which was considerable in those days.

His Education was suitable to this Birth, being brought up at *Westminster* School , from whence he was sent to the University, thence to Travel in forein parts ; then he came to live in the Inns of Court, where wanting health, he retired for a time into the Countrey : And now all our hopes of him might seem to have been defeated at once. But that God, who by his Providence, designed him for this place, brought him back with an intimate Friend and Relation ; who having suffered much for the late King, whose Servant he was, turned what he had left into Money, and to make the most of that, employed it in a Wood-yard in this Parish.

Our Friend could have no great Estate , being the tenth Son of his Father, who had four Sons younger than he was : and his Father was a younger Son of his Grand-father : So that though his Father had a plentiful Estate, and his Grand-father one of the fairest in his Country

try, yet but a small portion of these could fall to his share.

But what he had, he laid it out as Partner with his Friend, and so improved it, till he had wherewith to live like himself. And then, he that was never bred to a Trade, needed not be perswaded to ease himself of it. He found other business more equal to his Soul : Which having practised at first, with his other employment, afterwards he withdrew from all other business to this. He dedicated himself wholly to it ; made his Country his Family, this Parish his Wife and Children ; attended wholly to their good ; to keep up Law, and Justice, and Safety, and Liberty ; to save others from violence and wrong, to reduce them from disorder and idleness.

He was perhaps the Man of our Age, that did the most good in that Station : I should not doubt of it, having so great an Author. He that ought to know best, hath often said, *Sir Edmund Godfrey he took to be the best Justice of Peace in this Kingdom.*

He knew what he had reason to expect would come of this, the emulation even of good men, for they are but men. And he shewed his own infirmity in this, that sometimes he

was.

was troubled at it. But for others, he despised whatsoever they thought or said. He knew before hand the price of doing his duty, how many ill men he must displease, what Scoffs and Censures he must indure, what hazards he must run. And this was all he expected for his labour.

He thought it worth the while, to suffer this for God's Glory and the Public Good. 'Tis vulgar Virtue that puts men only upon safe good things. 'Tis Virtue in its Perfection, when one dares do well, and suffer for it. And of this degree, he shewed some as great proofs, as perhaps have been given in our days.

In the Plague-time, who would have done as he did? not only stay here, but to expose himself upon every Occasion. It was much to indure the very Air; that, besides its own Putrefaction, was filled with the steams of so many thousands of dying-breaths. It was fearful to see and hear the mournful Objects and Cries that went hourly every-where about the street. It was a desperate thing to Flesh and Blood, to converse with them, and to be in the midst of them. God knows, when I am called to this, how I shall perform it; But he did, what I have even trembled to hear; He fed so many

many poor with his own hands, distributed as well Physic as food, exposing himself to be pulled and haled by them sometimes. And that which exceeds all the rest, where the Officers durst not, he went himself into the Pesthouse to seize on a Malefactor.

These are instances of high a Courage, so undaunted a Zeal to Public Good, that if we should have the like occasion again, (which God forbid) we could scarce hope to find the like Instances. He could not shew the like himself at other times.

And therefore I shall the more easily pass over those things which in themselves were very considerable; those Watchings, and Hazards, and Toils, which would have been great matters to others; But they were less to him, because he had inured himself to them. They were by long and constant practice become so natural to him, that he seemed to have lost himself, no sense of any Labour, no Weariness of watching, no Apprehension of Danger, in any thing by which he might do service to God, the King, and his Country. There are but few such men living, the greater is our loss by his Death.

Pfal. xc. 10.

A great loss, if he had died a Natural Death. Then we should have submitted to the will of God. And so we must now. But we could easier have done it, if he had lived out his time, and done all the good we could have hoped from him. If he had lived the Age of a man, as his Grand-father did; or as his Father, to that which *Moses* calls Labour and Sorrow; or as his Mother, who is eighty six years old, and yet living. How much good might one do so qualified as he was, so disposed, so resolved, so versed in Business? How much more good might he have done, if he had lived to those Years? But to be taken off at six and fifty, as he was, when he might have lived much longer, to go on doing still as he did; the thought of this hath much uneasiness in it.

But then farther, to think how he was taken away; by a violent Death; He was Murthered; The very mention of this strikes horror into one that considers it. Human Nature abhors it. Much more, Grace in Christians; whom God hath strictly forbidden it, by all the Laws that are given to Christians.

But then, to murther a Magistrate, that should be the Keeper of those Laws; This is so much beyond Common Horror, I know not how to express

expres it. If it were an Assault, if it were a false Imprisonment, much more if the Murder, of any other person, the Magistrate is he that should punish it. But that he should be murdered himself ! To murder *Him*, it cannot be without the highest Affront, to Authority, and Laws, to the King, to the whole Nation, to God himself. Alas ! that such wickedness should be done in our Nation, in this City, in this Place.

But especially upon such a Magistrate, that was the blessing of this place. They could not hurt him, but they must hurt us all, for whom he lived, and cared, more than for himself ; for whom he also died, as we have too much reason to believe. Considering this, it concerns us all to know how he died.

There are ways, that a Wise man may die like a Fool ; that he can neither fight nor run away (as my Text shews us.) Thus died *Abner*, and thus died our Friend ; and this heightens our horror above measure. Had he died by sudden chance, or by open Malicious design, it had happened to him as it hath done to many others : But perhaps never any was Murdered as he was, so treacherously and basely, and with such bloody and barbarous Cruelty.

For the Treacherousness of it, if *Abner* were caught so, it is no wonder. 'Tis no hard thing for any one that hath made himself base enough, that will violate his Faith, and break the bonds of human society; to call another aside, and secretly to cut his Throat. The pretence of common Friendship is enough to enable any one that is wicked enough, to do this.

But in our case, there was no need of so much as that pretence or colour of Friendship. Any Stranger might do it to a person of so easie access; one that never denied himself to any one that had need of him; one that neither feared force, nor affected shew; and therefore never took so much as a Servant along with him. He was at every ones call, to do that which was his daily business; to make Peace, to do Justice, to do any good to any Person. Was it not a worthy Prize to get such a one into their hands? Oh Cowards! that could go such a low mean way to take him. Oh Monsters! that having taken him, could find in their hearts to do him hurt.

Well, he is now in their hands, as he thinks, to do them Service in his place. What business have they for him? What they said, we are not able to guess: But what they

they did, appeared by woful tokens in this poor body.

God knows where they kept him. We know only it was under restraint; and 'twas not altogether in darkness, by the Wax-candle-drops upon his Cloaths; and therefore it was not altogether Hell upon Earth; though it was like it in his usage, that hellish usage that he indured.

Ah poor Soul! How many comfortless hours did he reckon in that merciless Trap where they kept him? How many insulting words, how many reproaches did he hear? What Racks, what Bodily tortures might he probably suffer? And what Cordial, what Refection to support him under all this? We know nothing but what appeared in his Body; his sunk Belly, his empty Stomach, his blancht Tongue, were all witnesses of his Chear. *My Tears are my Meat day and night, while I call upon my God.*

Yet we cannot say they starved him. God knows what they would have done, had they had time; but in all likelyhood, it was the fear of Search that hastned his Death.

And the same death it was, that they deserved ten thousand times over. They can suffer no worse (if they are taken) than this, to be Strangled, and then the Law hath done with them.

them. But when they had Strangled *him*, they had not done with him so, he must be cast forth to the Birds and Beasts : and that with the formality of a Sword thrust through his body, that if men came to find him, they might judg that he had killed himself. Whether it were to save themselves from Suspicion, or whether out of malice to him, or whether both these together, God knows.

Sure enough, it was the worst they could do to *him* : It was that which being believed, would ruin all that they had left. All that they could not reach, the Law would, if he had Murdered himself. It must have ruined his Name, it had forfeited his Estate, it had brought a blot upon his Family. Nothing could be done more to shew their Malice, if that were their meaning.

If they rather sought to hide their own Guilt, it was surely an Infatuation from God : He took away their understandings, that they could not consider those things which every Child could not but observe. What, would none miss his Band, or take notice of his clean Shoes ? Would none look for the effusion of Blood, or take notice of that which hindred it, that so manifest Coagulation ? Twenty things more that have
been

been considered elsewhere, and are not to be repeated in this place.

It was surely an Infatuation from God. Who having suffered them to run on in their sin to the utmost, to make that scarlet sin of Murther, even blush at it self (if it were possible;) having suffered the Devil to teach them every thing else that he could think of, to consummate the Ruin of this good man; yet was pleased so to take away their understandings, that they could not see so many evident proofs as would be made to all the world, of his innocence, and of their horrible wickedness.

But now I speak of Discovery, me-thinks I see you all stirred up, as it were, expecting that I should name you the Persons that did this bloody Fact. I would I could, for sundry reasons. But I cannot pretend to that. I can only say with *David*, they were *Wicked men*. He was the common Enemy of all such, and it pleased God to let him fall into their hands. He fell by the hands of *Wicked men*, that is certain.

But if you would know more, I will endeavour to shew you how possibly you may discover them. Perhaps some that are wiser, would be afraid to go so far. But why so? I speak
for.

for him that feared nothing, but to lose an Opportunity of doing good. And in hopes to do good by it, I will be so far like him; I will not fear to go on with what I offered, as to the discovery.

There are three things to be chiefly considered in this matter. First, Mens Actions: Secondly, Their Interests: and Thirdly, their Principles. We shall consider each of these.

First, their Actions and Practices. Since we know not who they are that were the Authors of this Wickedness, at least can we find who they are that are not willing we should know it? They that have practised, and intrigued to this purpose, to endeavour to hinder the Search, or the Discovery; if they knew what they did, we have reason to judge they were concerned, for themselves, or for their Friends.

You cannot but remember the dust that was raised in the week when the Search should have been made; those Calumnies, and those various reports that went about, as it were, on purpose to hinder the discovery. One while he had withdrawn himself for Debt; Another while he was Married, and that not very decently; Another while he was run away with

with a Harlot; even what the Father of Lies put into their-heads.

At last, when they knew what they intended to do with him; they prepared you to expect it, by giving out that he had kill'd himself. You know how impatient they were to have this believed. I was told it some hours before the discovery, that he was found with his own Sword through his Body. Others could tell that he had two wounds about him. These things were found to be True some hours after.

But then they devised sundry Untruths to colour it.

It was suggested that it might be done in Distraction, which (they said) was an Hereditary Disease in his Family, that his Father and his Grand-father had it before him; that this Disease being stirred up by some mis-apprehensions, wrought that direful effect upon him, to make him kill himself.

These things (from whatsoever Author they came) being confidently said, were as easily believed by them that knew nothing to the contrary. I confess I knew not what to think my self, till I saw the contrary with my eyes. When I saw he was strangled as well as thrust

E

through

through, I soon considered, that no man could kill himself both those ways.

And then for the Scandal that was raised of his Family, I found upon inquiry, that all the colour they had to say it, was only this: that his Father was sometime afflicted with Melancholy, almost to Distraction; but it was before he was fifty years old; he soon recovered of it, and lived till the eightieth year of his Age. Besides, I am informed, that there never was any appearance of the like Distemper in any one person of all that numerous Family: Nor did any of his Relations ever come to an untimely end, as has been falsely reported.

For the Melancholy that was observed in our Friend, I think none, that knew him, ever thought it Distraction, or any thing tending that way; but a thoughtfulness sometimes, that proceeded from the Intricacy and Multiplicity of Business: I believe the weightiest business that ever he had, was that which made him say, some days before his Death, *I am told I shall be knock'd in the Head.* He said this in my hearing, without any great visible Concern. He continued the same he ever was, in his daily Conversation; Serious in business, but Cheerful and Pleasant at other times. Thus he used to be

be alway. He was so the last day of his living life; that is, till the hour that we lost him. And how he was afterwards, I suppose they best know, that were the Authors of these Rumors. That's one way to try men, I think, by their Actions and Practises.

A Second way to find out the Authors of any Fact, is to consider who they were that were concerned to have it done. It was *Cassius's* word, *Cui bono?* For whose Interest was it? Now consider for whose Interest it was to kill this Person.

They must be some that were not safe while he lived; or some that might be the better for his death; and that in some considerable measure, such as would requite all the danger they were to incur by it.

If you know of any that could not think themselves safe while he lived, you have great reason to believe you know the Authors of his Death. I have not so far been privy to his doings, as that I could be able to enter into this Secret.

Much less to know of any Personal Malice against him. He that was so tender hearted, even to those whom he punished, could not provoke any one to this height of Revenge.

Much less were they Robbers, or any such Poor Rogues, that kill men for what they have. These did their work *Gratis*. They left him all his Money. They took nothing but his Band, except Papers.

'Tis therefore very credible, that the Authors had some other Interest that moved them to it. And that seems rather to have been, against the Government and the Laws. They knew how firm he was in his Duty to both; and perhaps they had tryed it in something else than we know of. If so, they could not but think it worth their while to send him out of the World. One that durst do his duty, when he knew, whom, and what, he should provoke by it; One that would give so ill an Example to other Magistrates, which if followed, might be the Ruin of their Cause; What could they think of such a man? We cannot scare him, We cannot bribe him, but we can kill him. They could not have thought of a more Compendious way than this.

Especially, if the killing of him would dishearten others, and so be a means to weaken Authority and Laws. Such men cannot but know, that Publick-Spirited men are not so many; and they that are, are but Men, They may
be

be daunted, they may be discouraged. And what can do that, more, than the Terror of such an Example?

I doubt not, they that did this, would rather have done it Publickly for that reason. As we hang up Thieves for Example to others; so to hang up Justices for doing their Duty; Oh that would be a pleasant thing indeed!

No, Gentlemen, we are not come to that yet. God knows, what we may come to for our Sins, and by your Means. But it will be the longer first, if the Laws can find you out. And towards that, we have some guess at you by this Token; They that are against the Established Laws, it was their Interest to do this, That is the *Second* thing.

The *Third* Token is; by their Principles. And so, whosoever did this, they should be either such as hold nothing Unlawful, or at least such as hold it Lawful to do such things.

For the First, that is, Men of Atheistical Principles; they follow only their Lust; or their Interest; Which will scarce unite any number of men to carry on such a formed design as this was. Or if it had, they would scarce have held together so long? they would have impeached one another, and so saved us the Labour

bour of Discovering them by this Token. I do not therefore charge it upon them that hold nothing Unlawful.

But how shall we excuse them, that hold it Lawful to do such things? If there are such Men in the World, and if the other Tokens agree to them, they surely are the likeliest that can be thought of for this Matter.

But such a sort of men there is, even here in *England*, and we have them among us. I could not but think of them when I named the other Tokens, and so must any one that hath been conversant in their Books.

We need not put them upon the Rack, to make them Confess. They offer themselves, they tell us such things which we scarce dare tell you again. 'Tis scarce credible, how openly, and how grossly, they teach men these things. They are the *Jesuits* I speak of. And whosoever reads their Books cannot but know I do not wrong them in what I say.

I say, *First*, They teach men to raise such Reports as we heard of this Person.

And *Secondly*, 'Tis their Interest to discourage the Execution of the Law.

And *Thirdly*, They hold it Lawful to kill Men that would prejudice them, or their Religion.

If

If I prove these *Three* things, we have all the Tokens together, which I think are not to be found so in any other Persons or Society. Let them clear themselves as they can of the Fact. I will prove the Tokens. And *First* for their teaching of Calumny.

In plain Terms, to slander another man in Defence of ones own Right or Honour, and especially one of the Fathers to do it in Defence of the Society, some hold it plainly Lawful. Some say, it is a Venial Sin. For the Proofs you may find them together in the *Fifteenth* of the *Provincial Letters*. If so, what should hinder these men from raising all those Reports of this Person? Since it was in Defence of themselves, and of their Sect, if they killed him.

Secondly, That it was their Interest to kill him, 'tis manifest; if they have any design against the Government; And if either his Life would have hindred or discovered them in it, or if his Death would discourage others from being Active in their Place. But that it is the Interest of their Sect, and of their Church, to subvert the Government; and that they for their Parts design it now at this Present; I think this is so palpable, that I should but lose time in proving it.

Thirdly,

Tembarin.
lib. 9. p. 2.
Sect. 2. n. 4.
doubtes whether it be a
ny Sin. *Levan.*
Tusis. Anno.
1645. make it
but a Venial
Sin.

Thirdly, That they hold it Lawful to kill in such cases. For this, 'tis as plainly delivered in their Writings, as any Article of Faith is in the Creed.

They say First in General, To kill another, is Murther indeed, if you do it for Revenge, or any such Siniſter End. And therefore you muſt be careful to direct your Intention aright. And ſo by directing the Intention, though you do the ſame Act, it is not Murther.

* *Franc. Amicus*, in *Curs. Theol. Tom. 4. diſp. 36. ſect. 7. 1. 118.*

† *Adam Tanner*, *Theol. ſchol. tom. 3. diſp. 4. q. 8. n. 84.*

* *Leſſius de Jure & Jus. lib. 2. c. 9. dub. 8. ſect. 47. Si nomi ni meo, &c.*

Fillius. Moralium Quæſt. tom. 2. Tract. 29. c. 3. ſect. 52. Si quis detrahat falſis criminationibus apud viros honoratos poſſit occidi, quando aliter ſame damnum averri non poſſeſt.

Leſſius de Jure & Jus. lib. 2. c. 9. dub. 12. ſect. 81.

For Example (ſaith * *Amicus*, one of their Profeſſors) if one threatens to publiſh grievous crimes of my Self or of my Order; When I have no other way to eſcape this, I may lawfully kill him. And (ſaith he) 'tis plain that I have no other way, if he be ready to charge me or my Order Publickly, *Coram graviffimis viris*, before men in Authority.

Saith † *Tannerus* in like manner, One may kill him, if it be in Defence of his own Goods, or of the Goods of his Society.

Saith * *Leſſius*, If one endeavour to take away my life, by revealing a ſecret crime, I may kill him. Nay, if he endeavour to take away but my good name, by revealing a ſecret crime, I may kill him, ſaith *Leſſius*, and the ſame ſaith *Filliusius*.

Now who that knows what Informations our Friend

Friend had against them, can doubt but they might lawfully kill him by these Doctrines?

I name but one for each. Whosoever would see more, may find them collected in the *seventh* and the *thirteenth* of the *Provincial Letters*. Though if we had but one Author for each of these Doctrines, that's enough to make a probable Doctrine, as they tell us. And then, if it is probable, we may practise it safely without sin.

I know what any *Jesuit* would answer to this. They would say that the Doctrines are some of them delivered as being only Speculatively true; that is, they are true in their own Nature: But they are not *Practicè sequendæ*, that is, in respect of the Consequences, they are not to be reduced to Practice. And why so? If they are speculatively true, why then are they not to be practised? They themselves tell you why, They would cause disorders in the Commonwealth.

Lessius hath a better Reason, for one of them He saith, one ought not to practise it, because if one doth, he may be hang'd for it. The mean while, if one can do it so secret, as not disturb the Commonwealth, (and then to be sure he shall not hang for it) in that case it is *Practicè sequenda*, 'Tis to be practised according

Filliac. lib. majora mala in Rep. sequerentur.

Lassus de Jure & Just. lib. 2, c. 9. dub. 8, Sect. 47.

talis in Rep. bene constituta ut homicida ple. æretur.

to their Doctrine. Or if not, while it is speculatively true, that the thing it self is no sin; Who that knows this, and hath a mind to kill another, and sees his Occasion, will make any Scruple of Practice?

Yes, (they will tell you) the Pope hath forbidden it, in that Decree of the Year 1665. which is set down in the end of the last *Roman Index*. To their shame be it said, These Doctrines are forbidden indeed; But not as being Untrue, not as contrary to Gods word, or having any Immortality in them: How then! He saith, they are *ad minimum scandalosæ*, at least they are apt to give Offence, (no doubt they are, if we Heretics come to know them :) And therefore he charges them upon their Obedience to himself, that they must not Practise these Doctrines.

Had he said upon their Obedience to God, that had been a dangerous word. It would have made them afraid to practise them, even in his own Service. He would take heed of that, not to spoil that which may be a Useful Doctrine. But he forbade it forsooth, upon Obedience to Himself, which is such a Restraint as the Pope may take off when he pleaseth.

And

And how can we tell, when he doth, or doth not, that which is in his Power secretly to do or not to do? We have only this measure by which to judg: He will do whatsoever he sees best for the Catholic Cause. If he sees it best for the Cause, we shall live. If not, you see it is no sin to kill us; even the Pope being Judg. So that now we hold our Lives at his Courtessie.

But thanks be to God, that gives us better security than that; gives us Government and Laws to protect us: Or else, no man here knows how soon he might be laid as our Friend is before us.

And we thank you, Reverend Fathers of the Society, if you were the men that killed him, as you are the likeliest if we may believe your selves; We thank you, that you did not begin with the Government first. That you killed *him*, not the *King*. There had been a Blow indeed. We thank you for not beginning with That. Though we have the less cause, if your Plot was against the King, and you only took this man away, that you might the better cover it. We thank you at least, though we pay too dear for it, that you have made the People know your Religion; that you have Alarm'd the State with your Practices; We

F 2

may

may live the longer for that, to thank you for it.

But then we must remember, we ow this to God, not to you. He it is that hath crossed your Design. It is he that hath taken away your Covering, and spread reproach on your faces in the stead. We see what you would be at; if not by this, by something else.

And if we saw it by nothing else, we know it sufficiently in your Writings. When your Doctrines are so plain, we have no reason to doubt of your Practices. God still deliver us from your Bloody hands. God keep *England* from your Bloody Religion.

This being at present as far as we can go in the Discovery; all that remains is, to return, and to consider our loss, and to lament over it. It was the Consequence of *Abner's* Death. *The King Lamented over Abner, and the People wept over him again.*

King *David* mourned for *Abner*. That was all that he could do. Our King hath done more. He hath not only lamented, but proclaimed his sense of it, to the whole Nation. He hath done it, once, and again, with all possible Demonstrations of his Care, and of his Concernedness, for the Discovery, and for the Punishment of this wickedness.

Where

Where the King hath begun to us, we ought to follow him, as *Israel* did *David*. We have wept already, we are here to weep over him *again*. And because I would not keep you long in pain, nor stir you up to fruitless Tears, I will endeavour to shew you how it may be a useful Lamentation.

There is no fruit to Godward, but is to be brought forth with Patience. And therefore *first*, I must caution you to that, in this, and all other Trials. If this Horrible Fact were committed by those hands, (which of all others we have reason by all Tokens to suspect) yet have Patience, and deal not violently, even with *them*. What by Law may be done, I would not preclude, I pray for it. But otherwise, 'tis Murther in you to kill a *Jesuit*, that thinks it none in such Cases as this to kill you. God be thanked, you are no Disciples of theirs, but of Him whose sacred name they abuse; that Holy *Jesus*; He hath taught us other Rules, he hath shewed us other Practices. *Love your Enemies, Bless them that curse you, Pray for them that despightfully use you and persecute you.* These Rules, and the like, are the Soul of the Christian Religion. 'Tis that which softens the Heart, and makes it gentle, and tender, and pitiful,

1 Pet. 2. 23.

tender, and pitiful. And so conforms us to the Image of *Christ, Who being reviled, reviled not again; When he suffered, he threatned not; but committed himself to him that judgeth Righteously.*

Indeed, when I consider the temper that is required of all Christians; I cannot but bless God for what I find in the Protestant Religion. I cannot but reflect on the incredible Patience that was found in You at the Fire of *London*. Though so many believed, and few very much doubted whence it came; that it was from the same hands which we justly suspect for this wickedness; yet there was no Tumult rose upon it; no Violence done that extended to the Life of any Person.

You then bore patiently that great loss both of your Houses and of your Goods. And now it comes to your Persons and Lives, still your Patience continues. Is not this a fair proof of your Religion? I bless God for it; and pray for the like in other things; Though this one is a great Testimony to us, even our Adversaries themselves being Judges, if they would but consider it.

Had either of these things been done or happened in any Popish Country; had the Protestants been suspected to have had any the least
Finger

Finger in them; there had not been one of them suffered to live in that Country. Alas! without that, What have those poor men suffered? What have they not suffered, who have had their Lot in Popish Countries? in *France* a hundred thousand Massacred in a few days. How many more thousands in *Ireland* in our Memory? not to speak of the like Slaughters, in *Piedmont*, and elsewhere.

Where can they shew the like in Countries of our Religion? They might have found it now here, if we had been like them. But blessed be God, we are not so, and I hope shall never be.

I beseech you to continue the same Patience still; not lose it for any, even the highest Provocation. Commit your wrongs to him that judgeth righteously; and under him to the Magistrate, that *bears not the Sword in vain*. The King hath already shewed his care in this Matter, Follow it with yours, in lawful ways. And if neither of these will do, leave the Matter to God. *When he makes Inquisition for Blood, he will remember them*. We shall see it in his time, which is best; and that by such Tokens, that all men that see it shall say, *Verily there is a God that judgeth in the Earth*.

Rom. 13. 4.

Psal. 9. 12.

Psal. 13. 11.

Next,

Next, Since we ought to imitate those whom we praise ; let us follow our Friend, in those things which were praise-worthy in him. I might enlarge this in sundry Particulars, for he had not a few Exemplary Virtues. But I must not enlarge beyond those that are of present Consideration.

Let us first endeavour to right him in the Injuries that he has suffered, and then not shrink from our Duties for fear of suffering the like our selves.

For the first, He was ready to do all right to others, especially if they had been so handled as he was. If any other, If his Murtherers themselves had been used thus, he had been the man to have righted them ; by all lawful means to clear the Innocent, to discover and to punish the Guilty. This Duty is now Yours, every one in his Place, to do all that possibly he can, to right his Memory, and to discover his Murtherers, and to bring them to due Punishment.

I need not much exhort you to this ; and therefore next, for that which may be more needful ; I beseech you to follow him in this, not to shrink so far from your Duty as to fear them, He feared them not for Your sakes.

'Tis

'Tis true, he suffered for it, he lost his life. But let the Devil get nothing more by that. He hopes and it seems to have been his design, to deter You from Your Duties, for fear if you be too forward, he may stir up others to serve You in like manner.

Well, but that will not certainly follow. They will not always find men unprovided, nor always ready to be drawn into Traps. You see they have awakened the Government, I hope this will also awaken You. O how happy should we be, (though we paid so dear for it,) if we could gain this by what we have lost; If all would be so vigilant, so resolved, that they might not know which to take next; If for one Sir *Edmund Godfrey*, whom they have taken away, we might see twenty, yea a hundred such Justices in this City.

And why not? The *English* Spirit is Generous and Bold, as well as it is Compassionate and Gentle. They may be persuaded or misled, but they are not to be frightened, or threatned; not easily into their Duties, I hope, much less out of them. That, I trust, will never be.

Especially, if we remember the good Providence of God, which is the *third* thing. If we look up to him, that hath secured us against so

G

great

1 Sam. xvii.
37.

great and so many Dangers. *He that delivered me from the Bear, and the Lion, (saith David) he will deliver me from the band of this Philistin.*

We may argue likewise; He that saved us in *Eighty Eight*, he that saved us from the *Gunpowder Plot*, he will deliver us from this *Cursed Conspiracy*. He will give this fruit of our Loss, and of all their *Machination* against us.

Who knows, but, in the end, it may prove a fatal blow to themselves? This, together with other things, which are now under Consideration, may occasion a fair riddance of all that Faction out of *England*. It may so happen to them, as the Apostle foretold it would to the *Jews*, when they persecuted the Christians at *Thessalonica*, That they would but fill up the measure of their Sins, that Wrath might come upon them to the uttermost.

1 Thes. ii. 16.

I pray rather for their Conversion. But whether that will ever be; Whether the one, or the other; we must leave that to God.

Psal. cxxvii. 1.
cxxxiii. 6.

And Lastly, Look to our Selves, that all our ways be pleasing in his sight. If so, he is able to secure us against all others: But otherwise there is nothing can secure us against Him. *Except he keep the City, the Watchman wakes but in vain. But if he be on our side, we need not fear what man can do unto us.*

There-

Therefore cleave we to him, with all our Hearts, and Souls. Hold fast that which he hath committed to our Charge, the Gospel of Christ. When God sees Truth on our Side, nothing can make Him against us, but Sin.

Therefore watch also against Sin, shew the Truth of your Faith by your Works, adorn your Holy Profession with a Holy Life. So living, Death can be no Surprize to us; even such a Death, or worse, if worse can be. Let them kill our Bodies, abuse them, mangle them, as this is, or worse; Let them burn them, and throw our Ashes whither they please; We shall lose nothing by it. At last, all shall meet again in a happy and blessed Resurrection.

FINIS.